

See page 14 for discussion of Chelveston and Caldecott

See [NDP-0041](#) for Chelveston boundary that was modified in December 2004

See [NDP-0042](#) for Caldecott boundary that was removed in December 2004

Village Planning Boundaries

Consolidation of work on village planning boundaries in East Northamptonshire

January 2008



East Northamptonshire Council

Contents

	Executive Summary	2
1.0	Background	3
2.0	Process	4
	2002	
	2002/2003	
	2004	
	2005	
	2006	
	Village Classifications	
3.0	Policy Formulation	9
4.0	Conclusions	9
	Appendix 1	10
	Village by village summary	
	Appendix 2	30
	Dates of meetings with Councillors	
	Appendix 3	32
	Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston Plan: Policies 1 and 2	

Executive Summary

This paper aims to clarify and summarise the process that was undertaken in the formulation of the village planning boundaries for the settlements in East Northamptonshire. It overviews the work that was undertaken and the conclusions that this work came to.

The initial work was to provide an interpretation of the Local Plan written definition of 'village confines', in order that the planning decision making process would be clearer and more accountable. Difficulties had been encountered in explaining the written policy and the definition to developers and to members of the community, most of whom expect to see a line on a map. Members therefore requested that work be undertaken to draw up lines for each village based on a consistent interpretation of the written definition.

Work started in 2002 to meet the structure plan guidelines and Member requirements. Survey work was followed by a series of consultations with Parish Councils and Meetings and then wider consultation on a draft Supplementary Planning Guidance document on village planning boundaries. The work that was carried out was instead incorporated into the preferred options for the local development documents for the district.

Following the consultation comments received it was considered that an approach, for the majority of the villages, that took into account the redevelopment opportunities of buildings adjacent to the planning boundaries would allow for a more sustainable development pattern in the rural areas and not create development pressure that could alter the character of the settlements. This has approach is now embodied in the Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston Submission Plan.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The idea of villages having established 'confines' was first addressed in the Northamptonshire Structure Plan 1996-2016, which was adopted in 2001. Policy H6 relates to housing development in villages:

'Housing development will be limited to within the established confines of villages. Local planning authorities will establish the village confines and identify these in local plans, taking account of land within or adjoining the village.'

When establishing the confines and identifying sites regard will be had to:

- *The impact of development in the form, character and setting of the village;*
- *The availability of public transport;*
- *The need to retain and provide local facilities and employment;*
- *The ability of local facilities and services to serve the new development;*
- *The need to meet local needs that will help secure a mixed balanced community; and*
- *The impact on local amenity and traffic.'*

- 1.2 In the explanatory text it is stated that housing development will only be allowed within the established confines of villages, any alterations to the confines will need to be fully justified.
- 1.3 Policy RE1 also in the Structure Plan considers small scale employment related development in rural areas, where any small scale industrial and commercial, recreation and tourism development will be limited to within the confines of the village. The same criteria are then used for establishing confines and identifying sites.
- 1.4 The original intention of the work was to adopt a Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) document to delineate the village confines linked to the policies in the Structure Plan and the written definition in the 1996 Local Plan. Work progressed within these parameters and a draft document was written. However with the changes in the planning law and the introduction of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act it was decided to incorporate the work into the Local Development Documents that would now be prepared as part of the Local Development Framework for East Northamptonshire.
- 1.5 It should be noted that throughout the process, in considering village planning boundaries, the terminology had altered. With the terms 'boundary', 'framework' and 'confines' all being used. The final title for these lines around the settlements is 'village planning boundaries'; this is to show the difference between what socially could be termed the village and the main built up area of a settlement where development would be focussed.

2.0 Process

2002

- 2.1 Work started on the consideration of village boundaries in 2002, with initial site surveys undertaken in mid 2002 by officer's. During this stage each village was visited and maps annotated and first draft boundaries drawn. Comments by the planning officer on the maps include areas not to be included and why. For example:

'Allotments allow wider view of the countryside', 'Well wooded area creates a break in frontage development'

'Mature hedge reinforces edge'

'Edge defined by riparian buffer zone'

'Footpath defines edge'

- 2.2 To ensure that a consistent process was applied across the district in assessing the frameworks, a set of criteria were developed. The wording of the criteria has changed slightly throughout the process but the meaning behind the criteria has remained unchanged.

- 2.3 Two of the criteria principles relate to how the lines around settlements are drawn:

- *Boundaries are drawn on the side of the road closest to development; and*
- *Village frameworks need not be contiguous. It may be appropriate given the nature and form of a settlement to define two or more separate elements.*

- 2.4 The remaining criteria principles relate to what is excluded and what is included in the framework area:

- *Existing employment uses, caravan sites or leisure uses on the edge of the villages which are obviously detached from, or peripheral to, the main built up area are excluded;*
- *Excluded are free standing, individual or groups of dwellings, nearby farm buildings or other structures which are obviously detached from, or peripheral to, the main built up area;*
- *Public open spaces and undeveloped areas of land on the edge of villages are excluded;*
- *Curtilages of dwellings are included unless considered specifically unsuitable. For example, large gardens of existing dwellings on the edge of villages are excluded;*
- *Areas of land currently with planning permission adjoining the built up area are included.*

2002/2003

- 2.5 Following the initial survey in November 2002 a pre draft version of a Supplementary Planning Guidance document with the suggested line was sent to all Parish Councils, District and County Councillors and stakeholders that had previously expressed an interest. Responses were asked for by the end of January 2003; however in order to engage with as many people as possible this was extended for officers to attend meetings around the District. The relevant map/s and an explanatory letter were sent out asking for feedback to the pre draft. The maps showed areas that may be questioned and listed the criterion that was relevant to show the consultees the thought process behind the proposed line.
- 2.6 The consultation was conducted on an informal basis in order to obtain a degree of local consensus. Many comments were received and, these are summarised in appendix 1 on a village by village basis. In response to the consultation some interested landowners also submitted comments, all of which were considered.
- 2.7 Following the initial survey and a pre-consultation exercise with the Parish Councils and meetings it was considered that the village settlements that had a restraint category in the 1996 adopted local plan would not require a boundary or framework. The restraint category was for the villages that have a distinctive form and character. The policy approach would be to treat the areas as open countryside where development would only be permitted if it involves re-using existing buildings or for justified exceptions. These villages are listed in table 2. In addition to these settlements it was considered that Newton Bromswold and Wakerley were of such a scattered form that there was no core area to draw a boundary line without encouraging significant infilling in an unsustainable location that would alter the character of the village.
- 2.8 Changes were made in response to the consultation and information gained from additional survey work that was carried out at the time. In addition, the draft boundaries were updated to incorporate the effect of more recent planning permissions.

2004

- 2.9 In March 2004 consultation was undertaken on the draft SPG after approval from the LDF working party in February 2004. Different letters were sent to Parish Councils that had settlements with different categories. These letters asked the councils to consider the amount of development that may be appropriate in their settlement and to draw on a map where they considered development may be suitable. Another consideration was the aspect of 'important open space'; again the councils were asked to identify on the map what open spaces may warrant extra protection from development. It was also stated in the letter that if no response was received by the deadline then it would be assumed that the Parish council was satisfied with the boundary. Officers, and in some cases elected Councillors, attended various Parish Council meetings to assist people in their understanding of the process leading to the drafting of the proposed framework line.
- 2.10 Letters were sent in March 2004, informing all County and rural District Councillors, other statutory consultees, interested stakeholders and those on the Council's database that the draft SPG was available for consultation. An article was also printed in the East Northamptonshire newspaper, the Nene Valley News, that is distributed once a fortnight to every household in the district. This article briefly explained the document and the purpose of the consultation. Documents were also placed in the libraries, including mobile libraries throughout the area.

- 2.11 Around 100 responses were received to this consultation and those from the Parish Councils and Meetings have been summarised in Appendix 1.
- 2.12 In November 2004, following a meeting of the LDF working party (ratified by Strategy Committee January 2005), members decided to change the approach to village planning boundaries for a number of reasons:
- The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 had been introduced and it was considered that in practice it was too onerous to adopt the SPG as intended and that work on the new Area Plans should be prioritised instead.
 - The Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy was published, which had implications on the level of growth for the area.
 - A draft of the district Rural Strategy was available which considered a flexible approach to rural planning and not one that is uniform.
 - The consultation on area based discussion papers (Issues and Options stage of the LDF process) had been completed and the representations were being considered.
- 2.13 At this stage, it was agreed that the Local Plan written definition would continue to be used for the determination of planning applications. It was decided to take forward the previous work and integrate it within the Local Development Framework documents in line with the new legislation.
- 2.14 Also at the November 2004 LDF working party meeting it was agreed that a series of meetings should be arranged involving planning officers. Two Members were nominated by the working party to attend each meeting along with the relevant Ward Member, to carefully examine the village boundaries on a ward by ward basis. These meetings are detailed in Appendix 2.
- 2.15 At this stage no written minutes were recorded on the discussions that took place, instead the maps were used as a discussion tool and these were annotated. This was to encourage an open round table discussion to take place. These maps have been retained by the Council, and a written explanation of the changes indicated on the maps is included as part of Appendix 1.

2005

- 2.16 Following the discussions with the Ward Councillors, the Parish Councils and meetings were consulted again in May 2005. This time the consultation was to ascertain their views on a variety of topics relevant to the preparation of the local development documents, not just village boundaries. These included the following issues:
- Open Space
 - Do green spaces make important visual contributions to the character?
 - What is valued about the open spaces in the village?
 - What uses would you wish to see planned for on the open space e.g. play areas, community facilities?
 - Release of Housing Land

- If there is a need for additional houses in the settlement, please can you rank the aspirational sites in preferable order or any alternatives
- Gypsy and Traveller Sites
 - Welcome any views on the approach to identifying sites for this purpose
- Farmsteads
 - What circumstances would it be appropriate for farmsteads to be converted
 - If re-use is supported should this be for local needs or part of a mixed use development
 - Check the enclosed plan for the correct location of farmsteads in your area

- 2.17 Different consultation letters were sent to Parish Councils and Meetings depending on whether they did or did not previously have a draft boundary drawn. The main difference in the letters was that those villages that did not previously have a boundary identified were offered the opportunity to illustrate a boundary if it was considered that some market housing may be appropriate in the future.
- 2.18 The responses received were primarily related to the above questions, which are not relevant to this summary paper. However a number of Parish Councils and Meetings did respond to the village boundary. Amongst the responses received there was an objection to the exclusion of a residential garden in Aldwinckle. Alterations to the boundary at Thurning, Luddington and Hemington were proposed. Also Hargrave, Achurch, Tansor, Wakerley, Woodnewton and Apethorpe requested that changes were made. Support for the proposed boundaries was received from Lilford, Brigstock and Laxton councils. These comments have also been highlighted in Appendix 1.

2006

- 2.19 The Council, as part of the LDF process, published preferred options documents for each of the plan areas:
- February 2006 – The Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston area
 September 2006 – The Three Towns area
 January 2007 – The Raunds area
- 2.20 The Preferred Options is a statutory stage in the preparation of Local Development Documents and there is a six week formal consultation period. The proposed village planning boundaries have been shown in the preferred options documents. The feedback received in relation to these documents is contained within separate summary feedback documents for each Plan area called 'Summary of Consultation'.
- 2.21 The village maps contained within the preferred option documents are the culmination of all the previous work originally started in 2002. The documents include the Council's preferred location for the planning boundary lines and, following further consultation at the submission Plan stage, these are the boundary lines that are expected to be adopted.
- 2.22 Table 1 shows the villages and their classifications in relation to the LDF documents. These have been informed through other evidence base reports and the village boundary consultation work.

Local Service Centre	Smaller Service Centre	Villages		
		A - Boundary		B - Open countryside
Kings Cliffe	Nassington	Aldwinckle	Lilford	Ashton
	Warmington	Apethorpe	Little Addington	Lower Benefield
		Barnwell	Lutton	Blatherwycke
		Brigstock	Polebrook	Caldecott
		Bulwick	Ringstead	Deene
		Chelveston	Slipton	Duddington
		Clopton	Southwick	Fineshade
		Collyweston	Stanwick	Fotheringhay
		Cotterstock	Stoke Doyle	Lowick
		Crow Hill	Sudborough	
		Deenethorpe	Tansor	Luddington
		Denford	Thorpe Waterville	Pilton
		Easton on the Hill	Thurning	Thorpe Achurch
		Glaphorn	Titchmarsh	Wadenhoe
		Great Addington	Twywell	Newton Bromswold
		Hargrave	Upper Benefield	Wakerley
		Harringworth	Woodford	
		Hemington	Woodnewton	
		Islip	Yarwell	
		Laxton		

Table 1: Settlement Classifications

2.23 Crow Hill estate, near Irthlingborough, has been added to the villages with a planning boundary. However, prior to the preferred options document no consultation on this planning boundary line was carried out. It was considered at the preferred option stage, that the area was of substantial form and met the criteria that the other villages possessed. The options that were considered were to draw a boundary that would allow some forms of development to take place, but different to those in a town. Another option was to consider the area as part of the urban area of Irthlingborough; however the area is divorced from the main town and not suitable for major development. The last option was not to draw a boundary and to treat the area as open countryside; however it was considered that some development would be suitable in the settlement. For these reasons it was decided to draw a boundary and take this through the preferred options consultation.

3.0 Policy Formulation to date

- 3.1 During the course of 2007, policy formulation was ongoing and working drafts of the Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston Plan were considered by the Council's LDF working party. As part of this process it was agreed that opportunities for conversion and redevelopment of sites adjacent to planning boundaries would allow for flexibility to meet local needs in an appropriate manner in different villages. This is in accordance with PPS3 paragraph 38.
- 3.2 All development within and adjacent to villages is to be subject to detailed criteria being met regarding local need, character and infrastructure availability. This means that there will no longer be a presumption in favour of infill development within planning boundaries. This approach allows for a more sustainable development pattern in the rural areas without creating development pressure that could alter the character of the settlements. Policies 1 and 2 in the Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston submission plan should be read together as they set out the role and development opportunities of settlements and the detailed criteria to be met before development can be permitted (policies 1 and 2 can be found in Appendix 3).
- 3.3 The villages of the other two Plan areas (The Three Towns Plan and the Raunds Area Plan) have different characteristics and needs. It does not necessarily follow therefore that the policy approach to planning boundaries will be the same as that for the villages in the Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston Plan area. Policy formulation for these Plans is currently in progress.

4.0 Conclusions

- 4.1 Overall the process in looking at planning boundaries for the settlements throughout the district has been lengthy. Ongoing consultation has informed the policy formulation and the approach is in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 3 and Policy 1 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy.
- 4.2 The Appendices give more details of the feedback received prior to preparing the preferred options documents for each of the three Plan areas.

Appendix 1

Summary of responses received, on an alphabetical village by village basis, to consultation regarding village frameworks.

Achurch

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 – no comments or changes

Parish Council

Aug 2005 – Query why a village boundary has not been drawn for the settlement, what is it about the form and character that excludes it? They have suggested a village boundary. Also refer that the village is not suitable for further expansion due to lack of facilities.

Aldwincle

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 – No comments or changes.

Parish Council

Aug 2005 – Query the exclusion of garden land in two specific locations – Cross Lane and properties to the east of Main Street to the north of the village. Query why domestic gardens are not wholly included. Should a distinction be made on land that has been redesignated domestic garden from agricultural use.

March 2003 – would like to see further protection of land in front of the church. However would like to see the boundary extended in the Fullers Close area, as it is considered that this piece of land would be appropriate for development.

Agent

May 2003 - On behalf of The Society of Merchant Venturers an agent proposes the inclusion of further land to be included in the framework. These parcels of land would be available to meet the local need, they also concede that only enough land should be identified to meet the needs of the village over the plan period.

Apethorpe

Ward member meeting

Feb 2005 – Removal of Hunting Way properties and Keepers Cottage due to relationship and setting of Apethorpe Hall.

Parish Meeting

Aug 2005 – Refer to Keepers Cottage and why this is now excluded from the village framework, if this cannot be reinstated in the boundary please can this be explained and why. Various other detail errors on the plan that they are happy to discuss.

Member of the public

July 2005 – Query why Keepers Cottage is not included within the village framework, it is well associated with the village rather than Apethorpe Hall. It has been included in previous drafts of the framework and no reason is given for its exclusion now.

Ashton

Ward member meeting

Dec 2004 – No comments or changes.

Parish Council

Jan 2003 – The parish council believe that the older buildings within the village setting should be able to contribute to the village for use in some way. Therefore they believe that the boundary should be extended to include the area around Green Farm and Chapel Farm. Agree that there should be no residential extension to the village.

Member of the Public

Jan 2003 – One of the major land owners in the village submitted representations, these focussed on the fact that if you draw the line tightly then you may stifle the development of the village, especially the reuse of some of the farm buildings. Propose that the farm buildings are located within the village framework along with the Manor House.

Feb 2003 – Another of the land owners in the village submitted proposals via an agent. They are concerned that the proposed line cuts through established parts of the village, they feel that if there is concern regarding further development then there are other measures of protection that can be used.

Barnwell

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 - No comments or changes.

Parish Council

Jan 2003 – agree with the proposed village boundary.

May 2004 – One further area was requested to be included in the framework, an existing dwelling adjacent to the boundary. It was also requested that the cricket pitch be designated as important open land.

Benefield

Ward Member meeting

Dec 2004 – Lower Benefield –no comments or changes.

Dec 2004 - Upper Benefield – several suggestions put forward, firstly the inclusion of the garages to the rear of Townsend Court, and also at the rear of Coronation Crescent. Include the land between The Long Barn and Magnolia House, the line should follow the property line around Ashley Farm. The land to the rear of number 18 on the main road should follow the field boundary. Land between number 11 and Winward should be excluded and designated important open land.

Parish Council

March 2003 – Agree in principle to the proposals.

Agent

Jan 2003 – Respond on behalf of the Biggin and Benefield estate. Propose the inclusion of four areas within the boundary, Druids paddock, land to the west of Ashley Farm House, Lammas Farm and land adjacent to number 31, Upper Benefield. In Lower Benefield suggest the inclusion of the Coach House to the NE of Berkeley House and the outbuildings associated with number 38.

Blatherwycke

Ward Member meeting

March 2005 – No comments or changes.

Brigstock

Ward Member meeting

Dec 2004 – Several changes promoted. Inclusion of garages on Grafton Road, also include those along Barnard's Way. Include the main buildings associated with White Hill Farm. The line should be drawn on the southern side of Lyveden Road between number 7 and 21. The line should follow the edge of the field line at Old Dry Lane.

Parish Council

July 2005 – Consider that up to 2021 a further 35 houses within the settlement would meet the strategic targets and the needs of the village. They approve of the proposed boundary with minimal extension in three areas so as to develop the 35 units. These are the southern point of the village along Grafton Road on the eastern side, an area to the rear of some houses on the western side of Grafton Road and the Kennels area, but not including the adjacent paddock.

Jan 2003 – accept the proposed framework.

April 2004 – supports the idea of village envelopes and supports its inclusion in future development plans. State that there is no justification for future expansion outside the confines of Brigstock and agree the present boundary.

Bulwick

Ward Member meeting

March 2005 – Several changes promoted, inclusion of Brook House to join up with the main line. Include the triangle of important open space and land on the corner adjacent to number 6. The Land to the rear of the Old Orchard, tennis courts and Nottingham's Yard to be included so that The Barn is within the framework. Land to between Gervase, Carbery House and The Courtyard should be included.

Parish Council

April 2004 – at a public meeting organised by the parish council, it was agreed that Bulwick should have the option to some limited development in the future. Some changes were proposed to extend the framework line to allow for flexibility. The important space designation should remain the same, but the right areas should be depicted on the map not peoples garden instead of the green.

Chelveston cum Caldecott

Ward Member meeting

Dec 2004 – Caldecott – Agree to remove boundary.

Dec 2004 – Chelveston – Include the garages associated with Hillside.

Parish Council

Jan 2003 – submitted 15 comments relating to the proposed plans. Six related to inconsistencies with large gardens being included when they have not in other areas. Four comments are querying the position of the line, one about not including the corner of a plot, why a stable block has been included, extent of out buildings is not shown and that the boundaries shown for one property are not correct. They agree that the military base at the airfield should be designated as open countryside.

May 2004 – No objections to the framework drawn on the plan that accompanied the letter.

Member of the public

Dec 2002 – The Managing Director of Manor Farm requests that Manor Farm buildings are included within the framework to allow repairs to a listed barn and for development to take place.

Jan 2003 – A local resident would like to see the area containing the church and hall to be included within the confines.

Clopton

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 – Inclusion of Home Farm.

Parish Meeting

May 2004 – Concern raised that a tight boundary will not allow the village to grow over the plan period and result in people leaving the village. By including the properties to the west of the village will allow infill development to occur to make a viable community.

Collyweston

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 – promote the inclusion of the garages located in Woodfield and Westonville. Also include the area on the corner with Main Road and The Drove adjacent to The Collyweston Slater. The line between 4 Ashtree Gardens and 83 The Drove should follow the field boundary.

Parish Council

Dec 2002 – The Parish Council request that the boundary should be tightened in three places.

May 2004 – Following a public meeting it was proposed to agree the village framework for the village as per the plan sent, but also to request that an area at Slate Drift had a framework drawn around it.

Agent

Feb 2003 – An agent for the Burghley House Preservation Trust, a major landowner in the village, suggests changes to the proposed boundary. These are on a large scale and include Manor Farm, Park Farm, and area to the rear of the pub and houses along the A43 at the southern end of the village.

Cotterstock

Ward Member meeting

Dec 2004 – Support the inclusion of all of the garden curtilage associated with the properties at the southern end of Mill Lane. Also include all the garden land associated with the properties on the southern side of the Main Road, from The Gate to The Dormouse.

Parish Meeting

March 2003 – propose four areas that could be developed to allow the village to grow and increase the vitality and viability. An area to the west of the village would be suitable for bungalows, two areas in the middle of the village may be suitable to 2 or 3 medium sized houses and the area to the north of the church could be sensitively developed and incorporated in the village. They would like to see more flexibility in the plans.

April 2004 – Proposals meets previous comments, would not want to see every spare space built on as this would have an adverse effect on the character. Would not want garden land to be built on.

May 2004 – At the annual parish meeting there was overall support for a tightly drawn boundary for the village.

Member of the Public

May 2003 – Submitted a previous letter sent to the chief planning officer from the **Parish Council** in May 2001, this was accompanied by the results of a village questionnaire, one of the questions related to village boundaries, 29 people responded that yes there should be a boundary drawn and again 29 people felt that Cotterstock should be classified as a restraint village. It was felt that the small pockets of land added to the character of the village.

June 2003 – Concern from a member of the public that the Parish Councils views are not consistent with the feeling in the village and should be considered as a personal view instead. Attaches some of the results from the village questionnaire in 2001 showing that 36 people to 1 think that the village should be protected from further development.

Deene and Deenethorpe

Ward Member meeting

March 2005 – Deene and Deenethorpe – no comments or changes.

Denford

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 – Support in the inclusion of land adjacent to number 4 Duck End, for the line to follow the field boundary.

Ward Member

Jan 2005 – Has not been involved by Denford Parish Council so cannot comment on their behalf. Would like to point out that many of the roads can only accommodate single traffic and therefore all the aspirational sites cannot be accessed in a sufficient way. There are sufficient plots with permission for the short to medium term. Thought that the plot west of School House was for one dwelling, but concedes that this may have changed.

Parish Council

Jan 2003 – query the OS map as not all properties were shown, land south of Browns Lane should not be included, the memorial area should be included within the boundary and that the two areas marked with the criterion D should be included in the framework, provide a revised map for consideration.

Jun 2004 – no comments to make regarding the framework.

Duddington and Fineshade

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 – no comments or changes for Duddington or Fineshade.

Parish Council

Jan 2003 – query two matters on the framework, one cutting out some garden land and two including some garden land.

Feb 2003 – Request that the line across the garden land behind Highfield be drawn closer to the property to prevent development here.

June 2004 – Request that a boundary is needed for Duddington in the interests of certainty. Proposed boundary is attached with comments.

Easton on the Hill

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 – Support the inclusion of the garages at the northern end of The Crescent.

Fotheringhay

Ward Member meeting

Dec 2004 – decided that no framework is required.

Parish Meeting

March 2003 – Results of a village Questionnaire were returned, showing that 66% of villagers would like to see the village status protected, 34% would like to see more development and have a framework line shown.

Members of the public

April 2003 – Land owners of the Old Vicarage, do not want to see any development on this land.

March 2003 - Land owner of Pigeon Row does not want to see development occur on the garden to the rear of his property.

Organisations

March 2003 – Trustees of Fotheringhay Village Hall want to make clear that they do not want any development on the land to the rear of the hall.

Glaphorn

Ward Member meeting

Dec 2004 – support the inclusion of land to the rear of Jasmine.

Parish Council

March 2003 – Pose several questions and queries to the proposed framework, would like to resist further infill development and for the village to be categorised as a restraint village.

Great Addington

Ward Member meeting

Feb 2005 – Several changes were put forward, firstly to include the rear access behind Redlands and Tea Tree Cottage, move the line to the eastern side of the road along Main Street and include the important open land area adjacent to Sunny Side.

Parish Council

Mar 2003 – There was high acceptance (78%) within the village to restrict the village size. They have submitted various small changes to the line, mainly in relation to garden land.

Hargrave

Ward Member meeting

Feb 2005 – Exclusion of Hargrave Hall and its curtilage, Sca Fell, The Ridings, Turnpike Cottage and Quawra.

Parish Council

March 2003 – the parish council could not totally agree on the boundary. Some thought some back land development would be appropriate, however the majority agrees with the outline map.

Agent

July 2005 – an alteration to the village framework is proposed to include the village green, Hargrave Hall and Turnpike Cottage, because they make a strong contribution to the composition of the village.

Member of the public

July 2005 – object to the important open land designation on land adjacent to the Old Bakehouse.

March 2004 – Resident of Hargrave wants to ensure that all residents are able to comment in the proposed framework.

May 2004 – A member of public believes that Hargrave is not viable for low cost residential development on the basis that it lacks amenities, which are readily available in Thrapston and Raunds. Also suggests that an area of land adjacent to the Old Bakery, Hargrave would benefit from an important open land designation or exclusion from the village framework.

Harringworth

Ward Member meeting

March 2005 – change the line from the northern to the southern edge of the road at Shotley Farm house. Support the inclusion of the important open land adjacent to 25 Seaton Road.

Parish Council

April 2004 – An open meeting was held and the boundary was broadly supported. It was felt that the land south of Wakerley Road should be protected open space and that the dwelling at Spring Farm should be included within the boundary.

Hemington, Luddington and Thurning

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 – Hemington - No changes or comments.

Jan 2005 – Luddington – Decided that no framework is required.

Jan 2005 – Thurning – Support extension to boundary at Darnebrook Cottage.

Parish Council

Aug 2005 – The Thurning boundary is that agreed earlier in the process. In Luddington a new boundary is proposed for the core of the village. In Hemington a slight realignment of the northern boundary is proposed, it is also put forward that the village hall is included but designated as important open space.

March 2003 – There were no comments relating to the proposed boundaries for Luddington and Hemington, however in Thurning the parish council would like to extend the boundary to include York Farm to enable the farming activities to be located outside of the village and develop houses there instead.

May 2004 – With regard to Hemington no changes were requested or additions required for important open land. In Thurning an alternative boundary was proposed which would allow for some small organic growth over a long period of time to reflect the needs of the local community and its changing demands to allow for a thriving village.

May 2004 – Luddington public meeting concluded to accept the boundary with the exception of a redundant piece of land to the rear of the Thornlee that could be used for development.

Islip

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 – Support the inclusion of the garages to the rear of Nene View.

Parish Council

April 2004 – The Parish Council are content with the boundary.

King's Cliffe

Ward Member meeting

March 2005 – Support the inclusion of the garaged off Park Close. Along Bridge Street the line should be drawn on the side of the road associated with the important open space. The line should be drawn on the opposite side of the road at the Park Close junction also the line should follow the northern edge of the road at Daleswood Rise.

Parish Council

Jan 2003 – Support the need for a boundary and would like to see the KC1 (1996 local plan allocation) to be included within the framework. Several other suggestions are made, some agree with the proposed boundary, other comments propose changes to be consistent and to prevent views in the village from being developed.

May 2004 – a public meeting was held to discuss the boundary, this meeting focussed on the deliverability of the KC1 site and that this needs to come forward very soon after at least a ten year battle. As long as the KC1 site is included and affordable housing provided then the village will be happier.

Laxton

Ward Member meeting

March 2005 – Support the inclusion of land to the east of the green associated with number 1, the line to follow the curtilage of the property.

Parish Meeting

April 2004 – A public meeting was held and it was decided that future development should be judged on its merits rather than be confined within a small boundary. It was also considered that the village boundary should include many more buildings which fall within the original village. Namely, The Church and its adjacent farmhouse, Church Barn, Meadow Barn, The Old Vicarage and The Paddocks.

Member of the public

July 2005 – Concern that their garden, Stafford Knot House, is not included in the framework when it has a previous permission.

Lilford

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 – Support the inclusion of land opposite The Hermitage.

Parish Council

July 2005 – State that they would be opposed to any changes to the framework to allow any further development in the village.

Little Addington

Ward Member meeting

Feb 2005 – No comments or changes.

Parish Council

April 2004 - Support the village framework as proposed. Identifies land that should be designated as important open land. Ribbon development outside the village framework and specifically between Little Addington and Great Addington should not be allowed.

Lowick and Slipton

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 – Lowick - No comments or changes.

Jan 2005 – Slipton – Include the land between Bakehouse Cottage and September Cottage.

Parish Council

Nov/Dec 2002 – queried the annotation on the map and what the criteria meant.

Jan 2003 – Confusion occurred with the conservation area boundary and suggestions were made on what should be included, these mostly had historic importance.

Lutton

Ward Member meeting

Dec 2004 – Support the movement of the line to the opposite side of the road opposite Elm Pond – 3 Milton Terrace, also at the south eastern side of the church.

Parish Council

April 2003 – Suggest several large areas to be included within the village framework, mainly all the associated adjacent farms, of which there are four in the village.

May 2004 – the Parish Council would like to see four additional areas of land included within the village framework; Shieling, Grange Farm, Manor Farm and Lutton Farm. Also propose areas for important open land designation.

Nassington

Ward Member meeting

Feb 2005 – Support the inclusion of garages at the north of Eastfields Crescent. Move the line to the eastern side of Mark Way. At Manor Farm the line should include the buildings. Land at the rear of 9 Station Road should be included along with 55a Station Road.

Parish Council

Jan 2003 – Believe that the proposed framework is too restrictive, but at this stage do not know where development would be acceptable to allow flexibility for development in the village.

May 2004 - Boundary is too tight and could be too restrictive for the village in the long term. Also believe that the treatment of gardens on the perimeter is inconsistent. They feel that a boundary that follows property lines would be more consistent.

Member of the public

May 2004 – A member of the public objects to the boundary for Nassington. States that all the possible and most suitable sites for further village growth are excluded. Some small scale growth is needed in the village to sustain the village.

May 2004 – A member of the public objects to a tight boundary for Nassington and identifies three instances where the boundary should be amended; Manor Farm, Land adjacent 44 Station Road and 58 Station Road.

Newton Bromswold

Ward Member meeting

Dec 2004 – No comments or changes.

Parish Council

Jan 2003 – The Parish Council would like to be able to decide each application on its own merits and can see the benefit of some small infill dwellings, however are unsure if a boundary would help with this or not, suggest a framework if officers believe that this is the right approach to meet their aims.

Pilton, Stoke Doyle and Wadenhoe

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 – Pilton -No comments or changes.

Jan 2005 – Stoke Doyle - No comments or changes.

Parish Council

March 2003 – Pilton – Suggest changes to the boundary, excluding areas designated as important open land, would like to include four properties to the south east as they provide important facilities to the village. Stoke Doyle – propose an extension to the boundary, the farm area as it is not detached from the village and garden land that includes a garage should be within the framework. Wadenhoe – suggest two minor adjustments, one to exclude an area and the other to include on the grounds that the Mill is already residential and adjacent to the proposed boundary.

Polebrook

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 – support the movement of the line to the opposite side of the road opposite Blue Door Cottage, also opposite Orchard House.

Parish Council

Jan 2003 – Draws attention to two areas of allotments that have outline planning permission and believe that these should be included in the framework.

Agent

Nov 2002 – Querying when information on frameworks would be available.

Ringstead

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 – Support the inclusion of the garages to the north of Burnell Close. Support the movement of the line to include the barns located between 50 and 36 Back Lane. The recreation area should be included within the boundary.

Ward member

Jan 2005 – Echoes the Parish Council's comment of only allowing limited development within the existing boundary allowing affordable housing where possible. This is due to poor infrastructure in the village and a large amount of permissions already within the boundary. One area with permission has been omitted from the map on the corner of Spencer and Denford Road. Need the term 'aspirational site' made clear.

Parish Council

Jan 2003 – Propose a slight reduction in the framework in one specific place. Also raise concern about areas marked with criterion G (areas of land adjoining the edge of the built up area with planning permission are included) and that any development in these places would need consultation with the parish council.

May 2004 – generally support the proposed boundary.

Stanwick

Ward Member meeting

Feb 2005 – No comments or changes.

Parish Council

Jan 2003 – Has no objections to the proposed framework.

April 2004 – The parish council held an open public meeting to discuss the framework and the proposed boundary was supported and should remain tightly drawn up to 2021. There was also support for the green boundary between Stanwick and Raunds to be maintained.

Southwick

Ward Member meeting

Feb 2005 – Support the inclusion of garages to west end of the village, adjacent to number 16, Main Street.

Parish Council

March 2003 – Would like to include the buildings at Townsend Farm within the framework, believe that residential conversion would add to the viability of the services provided within the village and would not be out of character in the setting.

Sudborough

Ward Member meeting

Dec 2004 - No comments or changes.

Parish Council

Jan 2003 – Agree with the boundary but would like to change the criterion for the land opposite the Manor House from an F (public open spaces and undeveloped areas of land on the edge of villages are excluded) to a D (The curtilages of dwellings are included unless considered specifically unsuitable).

June 2004 – The Parish Council held a public meeting and returned the comments that submitted at the meeting. These encompassed several different views including; extending boundary eastwards at Greystones; Identify the roadside part of important open land adjacent to The Old Rectory for development; The village framework needs extending only minimally for example between The Round House and Woodbine House; Important open land should be retained; Only a small amount of development should be allowed to maintain the character of the village; Modest development should be allowed; Boundary should be expanded to enable to development; Development should be limited to small groups of terraced and semi detached cottages; No further infill should be allowed; Small modest sized properties should be developed gradually over the next ten years. It was felt by some people that the Boundary is too restrictive and affordable housing should be provided through small terraced cottages.

Tansor

Ward Member meeting

Dec 2004 – No comments or changes

Parish Council

Aug 2005 – Village questionnaire shows that the majority of residents do not feel that the village needs any further building.

March 2003 – The planning committee would like to see three adjustments to the proposed framework, these all involve in reducing the boundary to prevent backland development.

July 2004 – The Parish Meeting sent out 65 questionnaires to residents regarding their views on the village, 30 were returned, the main results were 93% of people disagreed that people should be allowed to built wherever they like, 63% against further building to the east end of Main Street, slight majority against further building to the east side of Fotheringhay Road, 73% of people against developing the open land near the phone box, 80% of people against building on the east side of Cotterstock Road, slight majority against building being affordable, 63% support a no backfill policy, 63% support sympathetic extensions policy. The most relevant for this consultation is that 51% of people support the village framework, with a sizeable minority, 31% against.

Member of the public

July 2005 – Would like to see an area between Tansor Court Cottages included in the boundary.

March 2003 – A resident of Tansor queries why the entirety of their garden has not been included and would like to see it included within the framework. Also query the exclusion of the paddock opposite their house, they feel that this should be included as it is protected through important open land polices, if not included then there seems to be no reason to keep the designation.

Agent

Jan 2003 – Request that a plot owned by their client should be included as it would be suitable to have a single infill dwelling built there.

Titchmarsh

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 – Support the inclusion of garages to the south of Dryden's Close. The line should be moved to the opposite side of the road along the High Street to include the road within the framework. Tofts Close should be included within the framework. The important open land between High Street and Abbots Close should be included.

Parish Council

Feb 2003 – a member of the Parish Council would like to see the inclusion of garden land in the Polopit area as this is an established part of the village.

April 2004 – The Parish Council questions the exclusion of Islington from within the village framework as it is a substantial community in itself and shares a similar relationship to the core village as Polopit. Individual properties such as Titchmarsh House are outside the boundary, whereas they are as much part of the village as their neighbours that are excluded. Feel that there has been inconsistent treatment of rear gardens on the perimeter particularly in Church Street and Polopit. They also hope that the stricter definition of village frameworks will not prevent the provision of affordable housing.

Agent

May 2003 – On behalf of The Society of Merchant Venturers an agent proposes the inclusion of further land to be included in the framework. These include the playing field as it is a viable village resource and development in the village may allow for improvements to be made to the club house, as well as large areas of land adjacent to the proposed village framework.

Thorpe Waterville

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 – No comments or changes.

Twywell

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 – The line should be moved to include the road frontage near the Old Friar. The land to the north of Providence House should be included.

Parish Council

Jan 2003 – request three changes, one to include an area of garages, two an area associated with Manor Farm as separate framework and three to remove the old Friar PH car park and garden from the framework. Agree that Woodwell should remain as open countryside.

May 2004 – The Parish Council are in general agreement with the proposed boundary but would like to see the garages to the rear of The Old Bakery included within the boundary. They seek justification for exclusion of land to the rear of Launde Cottages and would also like justification for the exclusion of land to the rear of The Gables.

Agent

May 2003 – request a small extension to the framework for their clients to enable a dwelling to be constructed.

Wadenhoe

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 – No comments or changes.

Organisations

Feb 2003 – the Wadenhoe Trust state that they may wish to make representations on the plan.

Wakerley

Ward Member meeting

Jan 2005 – No comments or changes.

Parish Meeting

July 2005 – Consider that the village signs represent the most realistic statement of what is deemed to be the village. However it is not considered that any market housing is appropriate to the village.

Warmington

Ward Member meeting

Dec 2004 – propose the inclusion of garages at Acremead. Include the land between number 19 and 27 Stamford Lane. Move the line to the opposite side of the road south of the Police House. Inclusion of the gardens associated with 9 and 11 Buntings Lane.

Parish Council

Jan 2003 – consider that the boundary appears reasonable.

Woodford

Ward Member meeting

Feb 2005 – Move the line to the southern edge of Eady's Row. Support inclusion of garages at The Leys. Include the access road to The Warren. Include the area of land adjacent to Manor Farmhouse.

Parish Council

Feb 2003 – agree with the proposals put forward by the Council.

May 2004 – A public meeting was held by the Parish Council, there was unanimous support for the retention of the present village boundary and opposition to further large scale development. The Parish Council would like to add three changes to the views of the residents, firstly an area to the east of Church Street should be extended, secondly the framework should not extend northwards to the industrial area and thirdly the playing fields should be classified as important open land.

Member of the public

May 2003 – request extension of framework to include adjacent small site for development.

Woodnewton

Ward Member meeting

Feb 2005 – No comments or changes.

Parish Council

July 2005 – Propose a revision to the boundary, firstly to the rear of Byre House to move the boundary north, but with a possibility to extend to the west. Secondly would not want to see all of the aspirational site to the rear of number 21 Oundle Road, but would have no objection to include the barns closest to the properties.

March 2003 – Propose two amendments relating to the extension of the framework to include two small areas, one of which had recently been granted planning permission.

Member of the public

Aug 2006 – A member of the public would like to see the boundary extended to the rear of their property to match the neighbours land that has recently gained planning permission.

Yarwell

Ward Member meeting

Feb 2005 – No comments or changes

Parish Council

May 2004 – The Parish Council accepts the village boundary, but with a few minor amendments, land to the rear of 39 Main Street to be excluded and land to the rear of The Angel public house should be included.

Appendix 2

Series of meetings with Councillors and the villages discussed

Ward	Members	Date	Villages
General	Cllrs Feather and Peacock	2 Dec 2004	n/a
Lyveden	Cllrs Feather and Peacock and Atchison	7 Dec 2004	Upper Benefield Lower Benefield Brigstock Sudborough
Higham Ferrers	Cllrs Feather and Peacock and B Sauntson	16 Dec 2004	Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Newton Bromswold
Lower Nene	Cllrs Feather and Peacock and Hardcastle	21 Dec 2004	Ashton Cotterstock Fotheringhay Glaphorn Lutton Tansor Warmington
Ringstead	Cllrs Feather and Peacock (Sharman by post)	6 Jan 2005	Denford Ringstead
Dryden	Cllrs Feather and Peacock and Scott	14 Jan 2005	Aldwincle Islip Lowick Pilton Slipton Stoke Doyle Twywell Wadenhoe
Barnwell	Cllrs Feather and Peacock and Cllr Mrs North	18 Jan 2005	Barnwell Clopton Hemington Lilford Luddington Polebrook Thorpe Achurch Thorpe Waterville Thurning Titchmarsh

Fineshade	Cllrs Feather and Peacock and Bradberry	20 Jan 2005	Collyweston Duddington Fineshade Easton on the Hill Wakerley
Woodford	Cllrs Feather and Peacock and Hughes	8 Feb 2005	Great Addington Little Addington Woodford
Prebendal	Cllrs Feather and Peacock and Richardson	21 Feb 2005	Apethorpe Nassington Southwick Woodnewton Yarwell
Stanwick	Cllrs Feather and Peacock and Finch	28 Feb 2005	Hargrave Stanwick
Kings Forest	Cllrs Feather and Peacock and Glithero	7 March 2005	Blatherwycke Bulwick Deene Deenethorpe Harringworth Kings Cliffe Laxton

Appendix 3

The Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston Plan - Policies 1 and 2

Policy 1 – SETTLEMENT ROLES

A 4-tier hierarchy of settlements for the Plan area is defined as follows:

- 1 Rural Service Centres – Oundle, Thrapston**
To support their role as focal points for infrastructure and development in the Plan area, the employment and service base of these towns will be diversified and extended. Development opportunities include the re-use of previously developed land and buildings, other windfall development and Greenfield sites as identified in this Plan.
- 2 Local Service Centre – King’s Cliffe**
To support its role in providing services for villages in the rural north, the accessibility of King’s Cliffe will be enhanced through investment in demand responsive public transport services. Development opportunities include the re-use of previously developed land and buildings, other windfall development and a Greenfield site identified in this Plan.
- 3 Smaller Service Centres – Nassington, Warmington**
The limited service centre roles of Nassington and Warmington will be strengthened. Development opportunities include the re-use of previously developed land and buildings, other windfall development and the development of three Greenfield sites identified in this Plan.
- 4 Network Villages – Category A and B**
The dependency of the remaining villages on service centres within and surrounding the Plan area is recognised and the emphasis will therefore be on meeting local needs. Development opportunities in all villages for housing, employment or community facilities include the re-use and conversion of buildings within and adjacent to villages. In Category A villages, which have a defined village planning boundary, there may also be scope for other windfall development, subject to the criteria set out in policy 2.

In the Open Countryside, housing development will not normally be permitted and the re-use of buildings will be judged against policies 30, 31 and 32.

Policy 2 – WINDFALL DEVELOPMENT IN SETTLEMENTS

Planning permission will be granted for windfall development within the defined towns and villages where the developer has addressed and sufficiently demonstrated through supporting information that:

- a** the overall mix of housing types and sizes meet local circumstances and need and provides for a balanced mix in the neighbourhood or community;
- b** proposals for employment related development are of a scale and nature appropriate to the location and character of the locality;
- c** the scale, siting and density of any dwellings accord with the character of the surrounding properties and are satisfactorily integrated into, the settlement and the surrounding area;
- d** local services, facilities and infrastructure are sufficient to serve the development, or are supported or provided by the development;
- e** the proposal would not unacceptably block important views or vistas within the settlement, or views of open countryside beyond the settlement, and would not significantly detract from the appearance of the settlement from the surrounding area.

Proposals to replace existing dwellings with a higher density new development on the same site will not normally be permitted.