

## Summary of Representations Submitted to the Examiner in Respect of Wollaston Neighbourhood Plan

Respondent	Summary of Representation
The Duchy of Lancaster	<p>Support overall plan and the allocation of site HA1 as the landowner.</p> <p>Main concerns relate to the requirement for an adult gym on site, funding for refurbishment of the village hall and a specific requirement for a further 2ha for a community woodland. Concerned whether these requirements, as currently drafted, would accord with the CIL regulations and why the burden falls just on this site to address what are, in part, existing needs. Any requirements also need to be subject to viability testing when wider affordable housing, CIL and education requirements are considered. Would therefore welcome further opportunity to consider wording revisions to ensure that the policy and the plan comply with national and local policies. Preference would be to amend the policy to refer to these elements as 'contributions to' rather than requirements of the development, and include a specific reference to viability considerations at the application stage.</p> <p>The final sentence of the second para.of Policy HA3 should be amended to read "The affordable housing should be provided in small clusters throughout the development". Scattered individual units are not usually acceptable and are harder to manage, small clustered are usually preferred by RSLs.</p>
AWG Landholdings Ltd	Support for proposed allocation at Doddington Road, Wollaston for employment uses.
Brian and Jane Kingham	<p>Concerned that in some areas the plan lacks consistency, precision and certainty and does not seem to be designed to cover the period to 2031. Also disappointed by the lack of transparency at some stages of the planning process.</p> <p>Do not believe that the Hookhams Path allocation (HA1) is the best option for the village, as building most of the properties on one large site will further take away the village character. There are many traffic problems already experienced by local residents including: noise, safety, obstructions and health. There is no mention of phasing the development to ensure it meets the needs of the</p>

	<p>village until 2013. There are no designated green spaces anywhere to the east side of the village and the wording in Policy HA1 allows the community woodland to be moved to an alternative location.</p> <p>Concerned that there seems to be little use of any Community Infrastructure Levy in a way that will enhance the lives of those closest to the proposed development at Hookhams Path.</p>
Johnathan Alms	<p>Believe the entire basis of the Plan is flawed, given that the intention of The Localism Act 2011 is to give the power of decision making to local communities. From the start, the Plan has been based on a “top down” allocation of housing from Wellingborough BC, over which residents have no control or say.</p> <p>The proposed development is outside the existing village envelope and will be on current farming Land. The village infrastructure is already overcrowded, with insufficient parking, road capacity and access to main routes. The existing facilities in the village, including shops, schools, playing fields, village hall etc. are all under pressure. Wollaston has already experienced an increase in population of 14.9% between 2001 and 2011. Wollaston’s size means that it has already lost much of its rural character and sense of community.</p>
Susan Fowler	<p>Object to additional housing. The village young will not be able to afford the new homes and it will just bring more people into the village but still leave the problem. There are traffic problems in the area. The schools, hospitals and doctors cannot cope and there are insufficient bus services. Development should not be on greenfield sites.</p>
Irchester PC	<p>Support for the plan</p>
James Milroy	<p>Objection to Hookhams Path. The area is liable to flood and additional development will exacerbate this. The village is heavily congested. Hookhams path is a route to and from Santa Pod and there are numerous complaints about speed, noise and littering. There is insufficient public transport. Schools are operating at capacity.</p>
Jo Underwood	<p>Objection to Hookhams Path. The infrastructure of the village is inadequate to be able to cope with the increased population and subsequent traffic. Concerned about the capacity of the primary</p>

	<p>school and pre-school and the ability of local children to attend. The GP/medical facility will also be put under pressure.</p>
James Emmett	<p>Object to additional housing. Wollaston does not have the infrastructure to support more housing. Traffic is already very bad in the village. It will put more pressure on schools in the area and doctors surgeries/dentists. Development should not be on greenfield sites.</p>
John Griggs	<p>Object to designation of the grounds of Wollaston House as Local Green Space (Policy Env2). The site does not meet the criteria for such a land use allocation. The site is not of such 'beauty' as to warrant LGS designation. The gardens themselves are of no inherent historic interest, are not mentioned in the listing and do not fall within the village conservation area. Wollaston House and its grounds have no public use or recreational value. There are no public rights of way crossing the site. The sole current use of the land is as a private garden and grazing land. The site is not known to be of high ecological value. The site is more than just local in its character and at 7.6 hectares is quite an extensive tract of land. The authority has not demonstrated that Wollaston House gardens are 'demonstrably special' to the local population.</p> <p>Object to exclusion of Wollaston House gardens from the Village Boundary. The plan shows an illogical boundary that indents around the gardens whilst including land north and south of them within the village boundary. Wollaston House and its adjacent land is one of the oldest sites in the village and is quite clearly within the village boundary.</p>
Morgan Hurd	<p>Challenge validity of plan. Consultation was based upon false information regarding Scott Bader and the level of hazard of the site. Question whether proximity to the site prevents development of land off Irchester Road.</p>
Joshua Newcombe	<p>Object to further development in Wollaston. Developing within this village will spoil such a beautiful community, a community which already faces struggles with local services. Further development will lead to spoiled countryside. Wollaston will become more susceptible to crime further damaging security of its residents who aimed to live within a village due to its peacefulness, tranquillity and unspoiled</p>

	countryside.
N Wyat	Objection to Hookhams Path. The infrastructure of the village would struggle. It is difficult to get into the centre of the village due to traffic. There is more suitable land i.e. Irchester Road with good access. Agricultural land should be protected from housing development. Neighbouring properties will be affected. The value of property will decrease. There will be a loss of privacy. The size of the site could be increased in future years
Mrs D J Stone	Objection to Hookhams Path. There are other places in the village available i.e. the old shoe factory with easy access to walk to the shops. The site has had insecticides on it for years. There are busy roads each side used for Santa Pod.
Suzanne Dennis	Objection to Hookhams Path. The primary school is already full and this may also affect children in Wollaston getting into the secondary school.
Judy Dunkley	Object to the plan due to traffic problems and school capacity and the location of the site
Melissa Gurr	Objection to Hookhams Path. Money is the motivating factor as the village will not benefit at all as the parking, roads, schools and doctors services are already at full stretch. Development threatens village life.
Sara Alms	Objection to Hookhams Path or anywhere in Wollaston which is already an overcrowded village. The infrastructure cannot cope with more traffic, the schools are already over-subscribed and doctors surgeries are full. These houses will eat up more of our precious countryside and before we know it we will have merged into Irchester. Some of the close-by smaller villages, Grendon for prime example, should be expanded instead. This will make it of a size where the much missed village shop will be sustainable and the children of the village can go to the school instead of the majority of the pupils coming from the surrounding villages and Wellingborough.
Natural England	Natural England has commented extensively on the plan and associated documents during 2015. We have previously agreed with the conclusions of screening exercises for Strategic Environmental Assessment Habitats Regulations Assessment as well as making comments on the plan itself. As we have no outstanding concerns Natural England has no further comments to make through this current consultation.
NCC – Flood and Water Management	Welcome policies to reduce flood risk on developments and the inclusion of Sustainable

	Drainage where possible
NCC - Highways	<p>Welcome the changes that have been made in light of previous consultation response on the draft version of the plan. Paragraphs 4.44 and 4.45 refer to the barriers to walking and cycling. The plan could still be strengthened further by giving further details about other known missing walking and cycling links.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.39 is a new paragraph in the plan. It is felt that it would be worth giving a bit more flexibility around when parking levels are considered to be at capacity as they will be influenced by the nature of the road layout for on-carriageway parking and layout of carpark for off-road parking. Higher occupancy rates can result in double parking, waiting in traffic lanes and slowly searching for parking impacting on the local highway network. It is suggested that inserting the word 'around' before '85%' would give greater flexibility.</p> <p>Note that Policy DC1 does not make any reference to funding the transport improvements identified in Policy T3 from any future CIL receipts received, however paragraph 4.46 commits the parish council to providing cycling parking. If the intention is to use future CIL receipts for this and other projects such as the dedicated cycle route between Irchester and Wollaston, then we would welcome Policy DC1 being revised to reflect this.</p>

The full representations can be viewed at:

[http://www.wellingborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/2614/wollaston\\_neighbourhood\\_plan\\_regulation\\_16\\_representations](http://www.wellingborough.gov.uk/downloads/download/2614/wollaston_neighbourhood_plan_regulation_16_representations)