



## West Northamptonshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee

Your attendance is requested at a meeting to be held at the Council Chamber, Towcester on Monday, 7 June 2010 at 6:00 pm.

**D. Kennedy**  
Chief Executive

Contact: Frazer McGown, Democratic Services Manager  
[fmcgown@northampton.gov.uk](mailto:fmcgown@northampton.gov.uk) or tel;01604 837101

### Agenda

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
2. MINUTES
3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
  - Personal
  - Prejudicial
4. MATTERS OF URGENCY

To consider any issues that the Chairman is of the opinion are Matters of Urgency.
5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (IF ANY)
6. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND VICE- CHAIR
7. THE NORTHAMPTONSHIRE ARC  
(copy attached)
8. NORTHAMPTONSHIRE MINERALS AND WASTE FRAMEWORK: UPDATE ON PROGRESS  
(copy attached)
9. THE CHAIRMAN TO MOVE:

“THAT THE PUBLIC BE EXCLUDED FROM THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING ON THE GROUNDS THAT THERE IS LIKELY TO BE DISCLOSURE TO THEM OF SUCH CATEGORIES OF EXEMPT INFORMATION AS DEFINED BY SECTION 100(1) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 AS ARE LISTED AGAINST SUCH ITEM OR ITEMS OF BUSINESS BY REFERENCE TO THE APPROPRIATE PARAGRAPH OF SCHEDULE 12A TO SUCH ACT.”

# Agenda Item 2

## WEST NORTHAMPTONSHIRE JOINT STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 30 March 2010 at Northampton

**PRESENT:** Councillor Tony Woods (Chair); Councillor Chris Millar (Deputy Chair); Councillors Wendy Amos, Stephen Clarke, Richard Church, Robin Brown, Keith Davies, Andrew Grant, Brian Markham, Dennis Meredith, Chris Over, and John Townsend

### 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Barnes, Bass, B Hoare and De Savage and Mr D Dickinson.

### 2. MINUTES

Subject to the correction of the spelling of Councillor Stephen Clarke's name the minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2009 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### 3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(1) Councillors Millar and Woods declared personal interests as members of the WNDC Board.

(2) Councillor Over declared a personal interest as an ICON Board member.

(3) Councillors Amos and Woods declared personal interests as WNDC Daventry Planning Committee members.

### 4. MATTERS OF URGENCY

The Chair was of the opinion that the following item be discussed as a Matter of Urgency due to the undue delay if consideration of it were deferred:-

#### Decision on Daventry Appeals

Councillor Millar reported that the Planning Inspectors' decisions on the three Daventry appeals had now been announced. In respect of Monksmoor the planning application had been approved which would lead to the development of approximately 1,000 homes. However the other two appeals had been dismissed. He commented that the decisions had vindicated Daventry District Council's position and supported infrastructure led development and therefore planned growth, rather than being developer led. He recognised that there was still a shortfall of housing provision within Daventry but that was why the Joint Core Strategy was needed to provide a planning framework for additional development around Daventry and West Northamptonshire.

**RESOLVED:** That the position be noted.

### 5. WEST NORTHAMPTONSHIRE JOINT PLANNING UNIT FORECAST BUDGET OUTTURN 2009/10

The Head of the JPU submitted a report which updated the Joint Committee on the forecast outturn of the JPU's budget for 2009/10. He proposed that recommendation 2 be amended to read "That £135,000 be carried forward ....."

**RESOLVED:** (1) That the forecast budget outturn for the financial year 2010 be noted.  
(2) That £135,000 be carried forward to the financial year 2010/11 to enable the Joint Core Strategy Work programme to remain on track

and on target as set out in paragraph 36 of the Fifth Schedule to the recently adopted legal agreement between the partners.

## **6. WEST NORTHAMPTONSHIRE JOINT PLANNING UNIT BUDGET 2010/11**

The Head of the JPU submitted a report which updated the Joint Committee on the budget for the JPU for 2010/11. He reminded partners that the prompt raising of invoices would lead to more accurate actual spend figures. In answer to a question the Head of the JPU commented that in respect of the 2011/12 budget a report would be submitted to the Joint Committee in October.

A brief discussion ensued in respect of the level of financial detail contained in the report it being noted by Members, that appropriately, the Business Sub-Group looked at the financial position of the JPU in considerable detail.

**RESOLVED:** (1) That the budget for the financial year 2010/11 for the JPU and the confirmation by the partners of their full contributions be noted.

(2) That the Head of the JPU write to partners to remind them of the financial management requirements set out in the West Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit – Finance and Procurement Protocol to raise all invoices in a timely manner.

## **7. EMERGENT JOINT CORE STRATEGY CONSULTATION**

The Head of the JPU submitted a report which provided a summary of the consultation that had been undertaken for the West Northamptonshire Emergent Joint Core Strategy; explained the approach that was being taken to the analysis of the consultation responses and reporting those responses to the Joint Committee; and provided details of the total number of responses, their geographical distribution, form and proportion of responses in support, not in support, unspecified and did not know. The Head of the JPU commented that it was intended to report a summary of the actual responses to the consultation to the Joint Committee at its meeting on 26 July and then at its meeting on 29 September the Joint Committee would be asked to consider its formal response to those representations as an integral part of consideration of the pre-submission plan. This approach had been confirmed by Counsel as appropriate.

The Joint Committee expressed its congratulations to the JPU for the success of the consultation exercise in terms of its variety, effectiveness and the response from the public.

A discussion ensued concerning Appendix 4 of the report which provided an analysis of the responses. It was noted that the vision did not appear to be supported however from this analysis there was nothing to say what people did not like about it. This needed to be understood before any consideration might be given to changing the vision. The analysis also showed other inconsistencies where respondents had given support to the provision of new schools, higher education opportunities and other facilities but had not supported the need for new infrastructure of which these would form part. Comment was made that people often responded to consultations when they perceived a threat to themselves. Therefore it was no surprise to find that the vast majority of responses came from those areas that were most likely to be affected by the proposals and that their responses may, on further analysis, show negative indications consistently through the questionnaire. It would be no surprise to find that villages outlying Northampton would not wish to see development near their village but the Committee would still need to evaluate the development options so as to allocate sufficient new land for development. Everyone whether they lived in a rural or urban environment should expect a good quality of life. It was noted that following the General Election, should there be a change in national policy there may be a need to review the LDF but the vision in many respects would remain similar as it referred to the quality of place and not numbers.

In response to a question the Head of the JPU described the programme of Member workshops and Committee meetings and further consultation leading up to the submission of the Joint Core Strategy to the Secretary of State in 2011. He also noted that as the analysis of the responses to the consultation progressed any issues that arose from this would be incorporated into the already planned Member workshops.

- RESOLVED:**
- (1) That the summary of the consultation undertaken for the West Northamptonshire Emergent Joint Core Strategy be noted.
  - (2) That the approach to the analysis of the consultation responses to the Emergent Joint Core Strategy and reporting those responses to the Joint Strategic Planning Committee be agreed.
  - (3) That the details of the total number of responses to the Emergent Joint Core Strategy, the geographical distribution, form and proportion of responses in support, not in support, unspecified and do not know be noted.

## **8. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION- PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SUPPLEMENTARY PROCEDURE RULES**

The SNC Head of Corporate Services submitted a report which proposed three amendments to the Joint Committee's public participation procedures so as to clarify:

- (i) In relation to the right to speak to a specific agenda item at a meeting that the speaker's contribution is duly listened to and minuted but that as with petitions and questions no debate ensues;
- (ii) Public participation rights are extended to all members of the public and not just to electors for the West Northamptonshire Area; and
- (iii) A standing agenda item called "Public Participation if any" is included for future meetings of the Joint Planning Committee to make clear that there is a separation between public participation and the Joint Committee's consideration and debate of substantive agenda items.

- RESOLVED:**
- (1) That Rule 2 of the Joint Strategic Planning Committee's Supplementary Procedure Rules be amended as set out in the Appendix to the report with immediate effect.
  - (2) That any public participation at future meetings of the Joint Strategic Planning Committee pursuant to Rule 2 of the Supplementary Procedure Rules is dealt with as a specific agenda item prior to the substantive agenda items.

The meeting concluded at 19.28 hours.

Item No: 7
Date: 7 <sup>th</sup> June 2010

**WEST NORTHAMPTONSHIRE  
JOINT STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE**

<b>REPORT OF THE HEAD OF THE JOINT PLANNING UNIT</b>
--

**The Northamptonshire Arc**

**1. Background**

- 1.1 A report outlining the concept of the Northamptonshire Arc entitled "*The Big Idea*" was produced by Northamptonshire County Council in April 2010. It advocated the fact that no single overall strategy existed which pulled together all the plans for the county in a way that offered a coherent approach, or expressed priorities in a practical spatial way. Moreover, no overarching advocacy document for external investment in Northamptonshire existed.
- 1.2 Northamptonshire County Council's Cabinet formally considered that report at its meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> April and resolved to:
- Approve and adopt the principle of the Northamptonshire Arc as the overall spatial concept to guide future planning and investment in Northamptonshire by the County Council and as a key policy and advocacy document for Northamptonshire;
  - Agree that a formal public consultation be undertaken and the outcome reported back to Cabinet;
  - Agree that a Northamptonshire Arc Connectivity Strategy be developed; and
  - Agree that the County Council invite the borough and district councils to consider adopting the Northamptonshire Arc as part of their policy frameworks
- 1.3 Formal consultation on the Northamptonshire Arc is yet to be undertaken, though it is anticipated to be subject to public consultation from late May/early June 2010 for a period of around 6 – 8 weeks: the precise time scale for the consultation is yet to be determined. The purpose of this report is to consider the West Northamptonshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee's formal response to the emerging Arc document once the consultation is launched. The final draft of the document was not available at the time of drafting this report. It is anticipated, however, that it will be available by the date of the Committee. The final draft of the document will be circulated to all on circulation list for the Committee as soon as it becomes available from the County Council and this will then form an Appendix to this report.

## **2. Recommendations**

### **2.1 That the Joint Strategic Planning Committee;**

- i) Considers its position regarding the non-statutory principle of the Arc in attempting to raise the profile of Northamptonshire, particularly in terms of developing a mechanism for increasing the potential for future investment,
- ii) Invites the County to reconsider the currently stated intention of the Arc to be a unifying alternative to the two Joint Core Strategies in Northamptonshire.
- ii) Considers the status, role and function of the Arc document, especially in terms of how it proposes to relate to the emerging statutory strategic spatial planning document for West Northamptonshire: the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy, together with the rest of the planning policy documents forming part of the statutory Local Development Framework (LDF) for West Northamptonshire, as set out in the approved West Northamptonshire Local Development Scheme (LDS) February 2010.

## **3. The Northamptonshire Arc**

3.1 Northamptonshire County Council's cabinet report outlines what they consider to be the purpose for the Arc and highlights that they consider there to be a need for an approach that articulates and reflects local ambitions at a county level and complements the Northamptonshire Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). It also states that it is essential that this approach acknowledges Northamptonshire's wider strategic location and proximity to London and the Greater South East and the opportunities and challenges this presents, particularly in relation to the Housing Growth Agenda.

3.2 In addition, from a strategic perspective, it states that it is important to have a policy document in place, which can inform and shape decisions on transport, economic development and regeneration, environmental and other investment related activities. This framework will help to shape and inform responses to external drivers and help to put local priorities and activities into context. It will also help to ensure that Northamptonshire capitalises on its strategic location, access to national networks, and other opportunities. This framework is termed the Northamptonshire Arc.

3.3 Three thematic outcomes are outlined as underpinning the framework of the Northamptonshire Arc. These are:

- Transformed connectivity;
- Leadership on climate change & biodiversity; and
- A stronger and greener economy.

- 3.4 A series of sub-regional priorities and activities are then identified which flow from, reflect, and will help deliver these outcomes. The County Council's stated intention here is to provide further clarity and focus, particularly at the county level. This, the County Council consider, will help to strengthen and align existing activity. They further consider this will demonstrate collectively how such sub-regional priorities and activities fit with and complement external agendas and local ambitions, as well as helping to identify and address gaps. It will also, they consider, help to influence decisions on investment, both internal and external to the county, and action on delivery.
- 3.5 The report continues by indicating that the Northamptonshire Arc will help to shape and guide the formulation and content of important new documents and investment plans.
- The Single Conversation (between the Homes and Communities Agency and Local Authorities);
  - Regional Funding Advice;
  - The Digital Britain Agenda;
  - Creating Cleaner Jobs;
  - The Delivery of a Sustainable Transport System (DaSTS) Agenda;
  - An increasing emphasis on the Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths (STEM) Framework ;
  - Plans to develop a new high speed rail line between London and the north (HS2); and
  - The National Roads Programme and Managed Motorway proposals.
- 3.6 It is worth noting that since the original draft of the Northamptonshire Arc document was produced, the County Council have proposed to make clearer the relationship that the Arc document will have with the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy together with other related spatial development plan documents prepared by the JPU and its partner authorities forming part of the West Northamptonshire LDF. These documents are referred to in the approved West Northamptonshire Joint Local Development Scheme (LDS), February 2010. The precise detail of the proposed changes the County Council propose to make to the Arc document to achieve this are not yet known, they will be included in a revised version of the document released for public consultation in late May/early June, and as stated at paragraph 1.3 above, this revised version of the document will be circulated to those on the circulation list for this Committee when it is available from the County Council.

Considerations relating to the Arc identified by the Officers of the West Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit that the Joint Strategic Planning Committee may wish to bear in mind.

- 3.7 The officer considerations set out below are offered without prejudice to the Committee's consideration of the Northamptonshire Arc document and are expressed entirely without prejudice to any future action national Government may take regarding the planning system in general.
- 3.8 The principle of raising the profile of Northamptonshire, particularly in terms of developing a mechanism for increasing the potential for future investment may have some merit. However, it is considered that it needs to be made clearer in

the Northamptonshire Arc document, as currently drafted, how this will be done in a way that clearly expresses the relationship of the Arc with the emerging West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy and the other spatial planning policy documents in the LDF referred to in the approved West Northamptonshire Joint LDS. The Arc document must recognise the strategic lead given by the Joint Core Strategies for spatial, investment and infrastructure planning and desist from its currently stated position as a unifying alternative providing 'the overall spatial concept to guide future planning and investment in Northamptonshire..'

- 3.9 Articulating non-statutory local ambitions at a countywide level and reflecting the relevant Sustainable Community Strategies (SCS's) may, therefore, have some merit and it is considered this could positively assist in non-statutorily shaping the content of associated investment plans.
- 3.10 However, the concept and status of the Arc, as the document is currently drafted, fails to make clear its relationship with the emerging West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy or, indeed the other strategic statutory spatial planning policy documents referred to in the approved LDS for West Northamptonshire. Neither does it appear to relate in this way to higher-level statutory spatial planning documents.
- 3.11 The Northamptonshire Arc can only be a non-statutory document. The Joint Core Strategy, currently under preparation, will form when adopted, the only strategic level statutory spatial planning document for the West Northamptonshire area. This document along with other related statutory spatial planning documents in the LDF, will in turn, form the basis upon which decisions relating to development will be taken and how investment in infrastructure will be prioritised. It is regarded as important that the clarification refinements proposed to the detailed wording of the Arc referred to in paragraph 3.6 perform this role.
- 3.12 In the light of the Arc document not having any statutory role, whilst some informal non-statutory regard may be had to its contents by the JPU and its partner authorities in a corporate sense, it is considered that for this to happen, and work, its proposals need to more closely align with the emerging statutory West Northamptonshire LDF as a whole. Similarly, it should be made clear how the contents of the document are evidenced. Any implications associated with this should be considered and robustly tested through the full statutory development plan making process that is being led by the JPU and its partner authorities.
- 3.13 In light of the above it is not clear how the Arc, as currently drafted, is to complement the statutory planning framework (the LDF) being developed by the JPU and its partner authorities, especially given that given that statutory option testing has already been undertaken relating to the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy, this occurred in summer of 2009. It is essential that the concept of the Arc is not regarded as an alternative strategy. It is therefore suggested that greater clarification be provided as to the contribution it is envisaged that the Arc will contribute to the statutory planning process.
- 3.14 Further, in order to be incorporated into a core strategy, the Arc must be subject to testing and assessment alongside 'reasonable alternatives' as required by the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive.



- 3.15 The geographic area that the Arc currently incorporates is also questioned. It does not appear to cover significant areas of West Northamptonshire; notably around Brackley and the rural area to the north of Daventry. It is felt that this could have negative implications in that, for example, strategic linkages between Brackley and Towcester could be inadequately considered. Similarly, whilst a perspective on Silverstone is offered; DIRFT does not appear to be referenced in the report.
- 3.16 In terms of content there are aspects of the Arc that reflect closely the direction of strategic statutory planning documents. In particular, the Arc concept is focussed primarily on linking up the main settlements within Northamptonshire and in reinforcing the role of Northampton as a regional centre and highlighting its importance in terms of future economic growth and investment. This approach is to be fully supported.

#### **4. Conclusion**

- 4.1 It is acknowledged by JPU officers that their may be an informal, non-statutory role for the Northamptonshire Arc to, for example, articulate and reflect local ambitions and aspirations at a County level to complement the Northamptonshire Sustainable Community Strategy as well as to acknowledge Northamptonshire's wider strategic location and proximity to London and the greater South East, particularly regarding matters associated with securing finance for, for example:

- Transport improvements;
- Economic development;
- Environmental initiatives.

and other such investment activities. Associated with this their may also be an informal non-statutory role for the Arc document to help shape and guide the formulation of important non-statutory documents supporting such activities and associated investment plans. However, it is also considered that, as currently drafted, there ought to be significantly more clarification included within the Arc document relating to its status and how the contents of this non-statutory document is to integrate with the suite of statutory strategic spatial planning documents being prepared for West Northamptonshire as part of the LDF as set out in the LDS. The present concept of the Arc as an alternative to two Joint Core Strategies covering Northamptonshire is not acceptable.

Contact Officers: David Atkinson, Head of the West Northamptonshire JPU  
Telephone: 01604 838412  
E mail: datkinson@northampton.gov.uk

& Richard Palmer, Principal Spatial Planner, West Northamptonshire JPU  
Telephone: 01604 838521  
E mail: rpalmer@northampton.gov.uk

# Agenda Item 8

Item No: 8
------------

Date: 7 June 2010
-------------------

## WEST NORTHAMPTONSHIRE JOINT STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

<b>Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework: Update on Progress</b>
--

### REPORT OF NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER

#### 1. Background

- 1.1 A number of key milestones have been achieved recently in respect of the Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF): adoption of the Core Strategy, submission of the two site specific DPDs for their examination, and the proposed submission period of representations being held for the Control and Management of Development DPD.
- 1.2 This report sets out in more detail the progress towards adoption of these DPDs and the key strategic elements, policies, and allocations contained within them.

#### 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That Members of the Joint Strategic Planning Committee:
  - Note the adoption of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy.
  - Note the examination of the Locations for Minerals and Waste Development DPDs, and which includes allocations across West Northamptonshire, is underway with the public hearing sessions taking place in October 2010.
  - Note the opportunity for West Northamptonshire residents and organisations to make representations on the proposed submission Control and Management of Development DPD until 22 July 2010.
  - Receive a report at a later meeting of the Joint Strategic Planning Committee on the representations made on the Control and Management of Development DPD at its proposed submission stage.

#### 3. The Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework

- 3.1 In line with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act the Northamptonshire Waste and Minerals Local Plans (adopted March and May 2006 respectively) are being replaced by the Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF).

- 3.2 The MWDF for Northamptonshire is to comprise the following DPDs:
- The **Core Strategy** for minerals and waste development - this is the main component of the MWDF and sets out the development strategy for minerals and waste by outlining the broad provision that needs to be made for such development to 2026, and the strategic spatial considerations that will apply to enable this provision to be accommodated within Northamptonshire.
  - The **Locations for Minerals Development** - this allocates sites for minerals development.
  - The **Locations for Waste Development** - this allocates sites and locations for waste development.
  - **Control and Management of Development** - this sets out policies on which individual proposals for minerals and waste development will be determined and then implemented; this will include proposals for both allocated and non-allocated locations and uses.

#### **4. MWDF Overall Progress**

- 4.1 There has been much work undertaken in relation to the MWDF since work commenced in May 2006.
- 4.2 In the past few months a number of key milestones have been achieved: adoption of the Core Strategy, submission of the two site specific DPDs for their examination, and the proposed submission period of representations being held for the Control and Management of Development DPD. The following sections set out in more detail the progress towards adoption of the DPDs within the MWDF and the key strategic elements, policies, and allocations contained with them.

#### **5. Core Strategy DPD Progress**

##### ***Commencement to Preferred Options***

- 5.1 Up to and including preferred options, the Core Strategy preparation process was run in association with that for the two 'locations' DPDs.
- 5.2 There was a full consultation on the issues that had been identified and options for the way forward held from February to April 2007. This consultation included opportunities to comment on the acceptability of the sites that had been put forward for possible inclusion in the relevant DPDs. There was also consultation on the preferred options held from October to December 2007.
- 5.3 During this stage a Sustainability Appraisal (SA), including Strategic Environmental Assessment, of the emerging strategy and policies was undertaken (it was consequently updated). All sites put forward were assessed in respect of a wide variety of criteria (we consulted on the criteria used with the statutory environmental bodies). For those in the proximity of the (proposed) Special Protection Area for birds in the Nene Valley, a Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) was carried out. Both the SA and the HRA were prepared fully in-house.

- 5.4 The preferred options consultation for the Core Strategy and 'locations' documents led to responses being made by 1,400 individuals and organisations. A limited number of respondents gave comprehensive responses. As at the issues and options stage the largest number were representations solely objecting to the possible inclusion of one or more sites in the location DPDs. In relation to the Locations for Waste Development there was also a supplementary preferred options stage which ran from 28 August to 23 October 2008; 127 organisations and individuals made representations. None of the representations received from the statutory bodies at preferred options / supplementary preferred options stage raised fundamental issues.
- 5.5 As government strongly advises that Core Strategies should be submitted and go to public examination before location-specific documents, the Core Strategy was then progressed in advance of the 'locations' documents.

### ***Proposed Submission, examination, and adoption***

- 5.6 The publication of the proposed submission Core Strategy was on 25 September 2009, with an eight week period was allowed for making formal representations (to 20 November 2009). Representations were received from 66 respondents, who made a total of 280 representations. The level of representations was far reduced from the preferred options stage because as it was the Core Strategy there were no identified sites within the document.
- 5.7 None of the representations received were considered to raise matters of fundamental soundness, as a consequence the Core Strategy was submitted to the Secretary of State / Planning Inspectorate for its examination on 12 December 2008. The public hearing sessions commenced in late March 2009.
- 5.8 The examination process was undoubtedly challenging and we were asked detailed questions about our evidence. Much of this related to detailed evidence that had helped to inform choices made during the preparation process. There was, which had not occurred elsewhere, detailed questioning about the evidence that had informed the preparation of the SA.
- 5.9 A consequence of this was that the public hearing sessions were adjourned in April 2009 for the County Council to clarify its evidence base (but not to create new 'evidence' after the event). This placed a time lag in proceedings and the public hearings did not subsequently reconvene until September 2009.
- 5.10 A number of changes to the Core Strategy were suggested with the aim of clarifying the strategy & policies, and to address issues of soundness. These suggested changes were agreed between the Inspector and the County Council in November 2009. These were also publicised by means of a statutory notice in local newspapers and on the County Council website. In addition all those who had made formal representations on the proposed submission document were individually notified by letter and email. A total of 24 organisations made representations on the suggested changes (much of which basically repeated the respondent's previous concerns). All were passed on to the Inspector for his consideration.

5.11 The Inspector's Report was received on 1 March 2010. The Inspector's conclusion was that the Core Strategy was sound, although the suggested changes needed to be incorporated. A few further minor amendments were also proposed by the Inspector.

5.12 Following approval by the County Council's Cabinet and Council on 13 April and 13 May 2010 respectively, the Core Strategy was adopted on 20 May 2010.

### ***The adopted Core Strategy***


#### ***Mineral Extraction***

5.13 In relation to minerals the adopted Core Strategy states that provision will be made from 2006 to 2026 for the extraction of:

- 19.36 million tonnes (Mt) of sand and gravel (equivalent to an annual average of 0.97 Mt) provided from glacial and pre-glacial deposits, and the river valleys of the Nene (west of Wellingborough) and the Great Ouse.
- 7.9 Mt of crushed rock (limestone) (equivalent to an annual average of 0.39 Mt) provided from deposits outside unworked river valleys or from sites with old permissions upgraded to modern conditions.

5.14 This provision will come from both extensions to existing sites and new sites if they meet the spatial strategy for mineral extraction and are assessed as meeting environmental, amenity and other requirements of the MWDF.

5.15 The spatial strategy for sand and gravel extraction is to focus such extraction on the county's pre-glacial and glacial deposits together with the reserves from the river valleys of the Nene (west of Wellingborough) and the Great Ouse. This strategy is illustrated overleaf.



Map1: Spatial strategy for sand and gravel extraction

### Waste Management

5.16 In relation to waste the adopted Core Strategy states that provision needs to be made for waste management facilities to meet the following indicative capacity gaps that will arise by 2026:

- recycling capacity for municipal and commercial & industrial waste will need to increase by 229,000 tonnes,

- biological processing capacity for municipal and commercial & industrial waste will need to increase by 221,000 tonnes,
- waste management or advanced treatment capacity required to deal with the remaining waste (currently disposed of to landfill) will need to increase by 334,000 tonnes, and
- inert recycling capacity for construction and demolition waste will need to increase by 357,000 tonnes.

It is important to note that there will still be a requirement for disposal to landfill. The total estimated disposal capacity requirement for 2026 is 709,000 tonnes.

5.17 The spatial strategy for delivering this is that the waste management network, particularly advanced treatment facilities with a sub-regional or wider catchment, will be focused within an identified central spine (from Northampton through to Corby), and the sub-regional centre of Daventry. Development should be concentrated in Northampton, Wellingborough, Kettering, Corby and Daventry. Development in the smaller towns should be consistent with their local service role. The spatial strategy for waste is illustrated overleaf.


5.18 Facilities in urban areas should be co-located together and with complementary activities. At the rural service centres, facilities with a local or neighbourhood catchment will provide for preliminary treatment in order to deal with waste generated from these areas. In the rural hinterlands only facilities with a local or neighbourhood catchment providing for preliminary treatment, or that are incompatible with urban development, should be provided. Where it is the latter they should deal with waste generated from identified urban areas and be appropriately located to serve those areas. Facilities in rural areas should, where possible, be associated with existing rural employment uses.

5.19 Table CS3 of the adopted Core Strategy gives an illustration of the quantum of facilities required:

Capacity gap and management method (2025 / 26)	Facility type and average throughput	Estimated facility requirements (2025 / 26)
<b>Recycling (MSW, C&amp;I)</b>		
229,000 tonnes	Materials recycling facility (MRF): 50,000 tonnes per annum (tpa)	<b>3-5 medium or 2-3 large scale</b>
<b>Biological processing (MSW, C&amp;I)</b>		
221,000 tonnes	Biological processing: 25,000 tpa	<b>7-9 medium or 4-6 large scale</b>
<b>Advanced treatment (MSW, C&amp;I)</b>		
334,000 tonnes	Mechanical biological treatment (MBT): 120,000 tpa Waste to energy (WtE): 70,000 tpa (small scale) or 300,000 tpa (sub-regional scale)	<b>MBT: 3-4 medium or 2-3 large scale</b> <b>WtE: 4-6 small or 1-2 sub-regional scale</b>
<b>Inert recycling</b>		
357,000 tonnes	Inert waste processing / recycling: 100,000 tpa	<b>3-4 medium or 2 large scale</b>

Note:

- Estimated facility requirements - additional facilities or extension of equivalent capacity to existing facilities.
- MBT processes accepting 'black bag' waste (with recyclables removed through kerbside collection systems and household waste recycling centres (HWRCs)) producing refuse derived fuel to undergo waste to energy physio-chemical treatment.



Map 2: Spatial strategy for waste management

*Other strategic policies*

5.20 The adopted Core Strategy also contains policies for:

- The promotion of (a) sustainable design and the use of resources, to include waste minimisation in the construction and operation of new development;
- (b) promoting the co-location of waste management facilities in areas of new



development; and (c) encouraging sustainable transport movements associated with minerals and waste related development.

- Safeguarding mineral resources and minerals and waste sites / facilities from alternative uses and / or sterilisation by other development.
- Restoration and after-use of sites.
- Addressing the impact of minerals and waste development.

## **6. Locations for Minerals Development DPD progress**

- 6.1 As referred to in paragraph 4.1 above, up to preferred options stage this DPD was progressed in tandem with the Core Strategy and the Locations for Waste Development DPD. After this time it was progressed in tandem with the latter DPD only.
- 6.2 The period for representations to be made on the proposed submission DPD was from 15 January to 12 March 2009. A total of 716 organisations and individuals made representations. A very large number of representations related to one site (at Milton Malsor, and which is an allocation in the adopted Minerals Local Plan).
- 6.3 No representations raised issues that were considered to necessitate not proceeding to submission with the DPD. However, and on the advice of the Inspector, submission was delayed until the conclusion of the Core Strategy examination, and took place on 31 March 2010. On submission a few minor changes, and which did not change the intent of the DPD from what was in the preferred options document, were made.
- 6.4 The DPD that is at examination proposes the following allocations fully or partially within West Northamptonshire:
- Sand and Gravel
    - MA1: Dodford (allocation in the 2006 Minerals Local Plan)
    - MA2: Heyford
    - MA3: Milton Malsor (Collingtree allocation, 2006 Minerals Local Plan)
    - MA4: Bozeat Extension
    - MA5: Earls Barton West Extension
    - MA6: Wollaston West
    - MA7: Passenham South
  - Building and roofing stone
    - MA10: Pury End South
- 6.5 It should be noted that there are no crushed rock allocations in the western half of the county.
- 6.6 The examination public hearing sessions into this DPD are intended to take place from to take place from 12 to 22 October 2010. It will be a joint examination with the Locations for Waste Development DPD.

## 7. Locations for Waste Development DPD progress

- 7.1 Following the preferred options stage this DPD was progressed in tandem with the Locations for Minerals Development DPD (but not with the Core Strategy).
- 7.2 The period for representations to be made on the proposed submission DPD was from 15 January to 12 March 2009. A total of 113 organisations and individuals made representations.
- 7.3 No representations raised issues that were considered to necessitate not proceeding to submission with the DPD. However, as per the Locations for Minerals Development DPD, submission was delayed until the conclusion of the Core Strategy examination, and took place on 31 March 2010. On submission a few minor changes, and which did not change the intent of the DPD from what was in the preferred options document, were made.
- 7.4 Unlike the Locations for Minerals Development DPD, identifying every waste management site required to 2026 is not realistic and would not allow for enough flexibility. The assumption is that, beyond the specific sites allocated in the DPD, sites will come forward through the planning application process.
- 7.5 To help meet capacities required, the policies in the DPD (and that are at examination) identify:
- specific sites for waste management facilities within the county, and
  - specific (industrial area) locations where waste management uses would be acceptable in principle.
- 7.6 Sites and locations are identified by policy in the DPD in the following manner:
- Integrated waste management facilities;
  - Sites for waste management use in or adjacent to urban areas;
  - Industrial area locations for waste management uses; and
  - Sites for waste management use in rural areas.

### Integrated waste management facilities

A small number of sites on which an integrated facility should be sited and which would comprise both advanced and preliminary treatment facilities or a mix of preliminary treatment facilities. There are four such sites for integrated facilities identified, all of which are in, or adjacent to, key urban areas in the county. Some of these sites already have a waste-related use. In West Northamptonshire there is one such site identified:

- WS1: Northampton (East) - Great Billing Wastewater Treatment Works).

### Sites for waste management use in or adjacent to urban areas

Specific sites within urban areas where waste management uses or, where there is already a waste-related use, intensification or expansion of those uses, would be acceptable. In West Northamptonshire there are also three specifically identified sites:

- WS5: Northampton - Boughton,
- WS6: Northampton - Grange Park, and
- WS7: Northampton - Jackdaw Close.

### Industrial area locations for waste management uses

Specific industrial estate locations within the main urban areas and rural service centres (but not all of the latter), where appropriate waste management facilities would be acceptable in principle. In West Northamptonshire there are nine specifically identified locations shown on the proposals map:

- WL1: Daventry - Drayton Fields / Royal Oak,
- WL2: Daventry - Long March,
- WL3: Brackley - Boundary Road,
- WL4: Towcester - Old Greens Norton Road,
- WL5: Northampton - Lodge Farm,
- WL6: Northampton - St. James / Far Cotton,
- WL7: Northampton - Moulton Park,
- WL8: Northampton - Brackmills, and
- WL9: Northampton - Round Spinney.

### Sites for waste management use in rural areas

Specific sites within rural areas where waste management uses most appropriately located in rural areas (generally composting and anaerobic digestion) would be acceptable. In West Northamptonshire there is one specifically allocated site:

- WS12: Kilsby.

7.7 The examination public hearing sessions into this DPD (joint with the Locations for Minerals Development DPD) are intended to take place from 12 to 22 October 2010.

## **8. Control and Management of Development DPD progress**

8.1 Work commenced on the fourth and final DPD in the MWDF in 2007, the Control and Management of Development DPD. The intention was that it would be a concise DPD that would set out the Northamptonshire-specific environmental and other considerations on which proposals for minerals and waste development (on allocated and non-allocated sites) should be made, as well as the management regime required to ensure proposals are properly implemented.

8.2 A discussion document which described some of the issues needed to be considered in preparing this DPD was sent out in March 2008. This specifically sought views from those who are regularly involved in the development approval process, either through responding to planning applications (i.e. local authorities, statutory bodies, parish councils), or in preparing and submitting applications (i.e. the minerals and waste industry). However, it was not a closed consultation as views from other people and organisations who wished to respond were welcomed.

8.3 Because the discussion document was not identifying broad locations or specific sites for minerals or waste development limited responses were made.

- 8.4 Following on from consultation on the discussion document a document entitled 'preferred approach' was approved by Cabinet in September 2008. This set out policy areas to be covered by the DPD and the proposed policies that would relate to these policy areas. Comments were invited to be made on these policy areas and on whether or not the policies that were proposed were the right ones for inclusion, having particular regard to national guidance. Again, because the draft policies were not allocating sites but were setting out policies to control development, there were no matters of particular contention identified.
- 8.5 With the Core Strategy having been found sound, the Control and Management of Development DPD could move to its next stage.
- 8.6 The proposed submission DPD comprises three elements:
- Policies to determine proposals for waste management facilities not allocated in the Locations for Waste Development DPD.
  - Policies to determine proposals for minerals extraction not allocated in the Locations for Minerals Development DPD.
  - General development control and management policies.
- 8.7 National guidance on local development frameworks is quite clear that any policies, particularly development control-type policies, should be (a) kept to the minimum, (b) locally specific, and (c) not repeat national guidance. This is a significant change from old local plans and the very few authorities that have progressed development control-type policies in DPDs have struggled with the requirements.
- 8.8 The drafting of the DPD has been progressed by looking at the policy areas not covered in the other three elements of the MWDF, and then developing Northamptonshire-specific policies. Where it is unnecessary to provide a Northamptonshire-specific slant to a policy area, it is not proposed to include it and national policy guidance will instead be utilised.
- 8.9 As a consequence, the DPD contains development control policies in relation to the policy areas of environment, design, restoration, safeguarding, and implementation. Policies addressing these areas give guidance that adds to national guidance by stating what is specifically required for a proposal to succeed in Northamptonshire. However, there are no policies on traffic / rights of way, flooding / water quality, agricultural land, and unstable land because national guidance & legislation already covers these areas; hence further Northamptonshire-specific guidance is not necessary.
- 8.10 The period for representations to be made on the Proposed Submission DPD was from 27 May to 22 July 2010. At the time of drafting this report It is not anticipated that a representation will be received that raises an issue that will be considered to necessitate not proceeding directly to submission. On this basis submission would therefore take place next month (August 2010).

## 9. Comparative progress with other MWDFs

- 9.1 In relation to how the Northamptonshire MWDF is progressing comparative to other areas, Northamptonshire is the sixth county area to have an adopted MWDF Core Strategy. It follows Hampshire (end date 2016), Lancashire, Cumbria, Leicestershire (all with an end date of 2021) and Wiltshire/Swindon (end date 2026) in having an adopted Core Strategy (incidentally Surrey has a waste only one to 2016, whilst Suffolk has a minerals only Core Strategy to 2021). Northamptonshire will be only the second authority to have an MWDF Core Strategy with an end date of 2026.
- 9.2 In relation to the timetable for the adoption of the three remaining DPDs, assuming these are ultimately found sound, the Northamptonshire MWDF will be one of the first three MWDFs in the country to be fully adopted and the first to an end date of 2026.

## 10. The totality of policies in the MWDF

- 10.1 With the MWDF DPDs now either being adopted, at examination, or at proposed submission stage, the total number of policies proposed for the MWDF as a whole and what they cover is now apparent. There will be a total of 36 policies in the MWDF; this will be a reduction of 26 policies from the 35 and 27 policies respectively at the adoption of the Minerals and Waste Local Plans.
- 10.2 The list of MWDF policies and what they address / propose to address are:

Policy CS1:	Northamptonshire's waste management capacity
Policy CS2:	Spatial strategy for waste management
Policy CS3:	Strategy for waste disposal
Policy CS4:	Spatial strategy for mineral extraction
Policy CS5:	Providing for an adequate supply of aggregates
Policy CS6:	Building and roofing stone
Policy CS7:	Sustainable design and use of resources
Policy CS8:	Co-location of waste management facilities with new development
Policy CS9:	Encouraging sustainable transport movements
Policy CS10:	Minerals Safeguarding Areas
Policy CS11:	Safeguarding development from alternative uses
Policy CS12:	Development in the vicinity of minerals and waste development
Policy CS13:	Restoration and after-use of minerals and waste development
Policy CS14:	Addressing the impact of proposed minerals and waste development
Policy M1:	Sites for the provision of sand and gravel
Policy M2:	Sites for the provision of crushed rock
Policy M3:	Sites for the provision of building and roofing stone
Policy M4:	Sites for the provision of secondary and recycled materials
Policy W1:	Sites for integrated waste management facilities
Policy W2:	Sites for waste management use in or adjacent to urban areas
Policy W3:	Industrial area locations for waste management uses
Policy W4:	Sites for waste management use in rural areas
Policy CMD1:	Development criteria for non-inert waste management facilities
Policy CMD2:	Development criteria for non-inert waste disposal

Policy CMD3:	Development criteria for inert waste disposal
Policy CMD4:	Development criteria for mineral extraction
Policy CMD5:	Criteria for secondary and recycled aggregate processing facilities
Policy CMD6:	Development criteria for borrow pit extraction
Policy CMD7:	Natural assets and resources
Policy CMD8:	Landscape character
Policy CMD9:	Historic environment
Policy CMD10:	Layout and design quality
Policy CMD11:	MSAs – Requirements for non-mineral related development
Policy CMD12:	Preventing land use conflict
Policy CMD13:	Restoration and after-use
Policy CMD14:	Implementation

## **11. Conclusion**

11.1 The MWDF is progressing to adoption and it is anticipated that it will be fully adopted by mid 2011. The next key stage will be the conclusion of the proposed submission period for representations on the Control and Management of Development DPD. A report on the representations arising from this will be brought to a later meeting of the Joint Strategic Planning Committee.