

Comments from feedback forms regarding the draft policies – September 2020

62 responses to the draft policies were received.

1 responses to the Call for Sites was received (Bastion)

2 consultations in advance of a potential call for sites was held, although these two did not materialise in practice.

Written comments on the policies which were received are logged below:

Policy Topic:	Comments
1. Housing Growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited rate of growth if possible with Government Policies • Doubtful that this rate of growth will be necessary as the aging population of our village will mean that current housing becomes available • The suggested growth in the policy MUST be able to be supported by the existing infrastructure – this should be investigated before the figure is finalised. • There is likely some growth because of Government plans but it must be contained and in keeping with no resources (shops, schools etc). • There is no need for start-up homes and there is no education or other infrastructure to support them • I support these objectives • I cannot support the proposed change to village envelope because it unnecessarily endangers a number of green spaces that should remain outside the scope of development. Developing outside it – which I suspect is the only way to achieve the 15 house target – would damage the character of the village.
2. Pattern of development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ribbon Development, less backfill, safe access/egress to roads • The majority of large infill sites have been identified on three sides of Top Farm. Wrongly concentrates new development in this area with adverse impact on rurality and current properties. • In our view, Brook Street has a number of sites suitable for development which are not prone to flooding and due to their smaller ring-fenced nature would limit scale of proposed developments. Access issues could be overcome by creating passing places or a one-way system along the through road.

Comments from feedback forms regarding the draft policies – September 2020

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Point 6f doesn't seem to be in line with section 4 point 7. Should 6F be reworded to reflect the need for care to preserve and minimise damage to trees in all cases, with removal or reduction only being allowed as the last resort. • I think covers all possible areas and should be cut back • I disagree. The proposed pattern of development may be too large. • Agree but not sure where/how you can fit in new buildings given the constraints listed • Agree but there is no space within the proposed settlement area to fit more than 4 or 5 homes • If there must be further development then I agree completely that it should comply with the suggested criteria. I would suggest that the reference to trees should be expanded to explicitly require full independent ecological assessment of sites before development is allowed. • A vast number of properties in the Hargrave are backfill and allows the growth we need to survive as a village without encroaching outside the village boundary¹ • Do not agree that backfill is a problem. ¹
<p>3. Design and Architecture of Houses</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mixture we have is suitable • I should like to see houses incorporating semi-permeable driveways instead of tarmac (which is urban in style and unsustainable) • All recent new developments have been different (brickwork, architecture, garage designs etc) The village is becoming a midge-modge. This is making the character of our village unclear. • Use local materials • I would like some terraced cottages included in the village • I agree but would not object to a "one-off" design of specific architectural influence as no real standard village property design at present. • Designs of "architectural merit" should be allowed

¹ Entries marked with a 1 were all received very late beyond the deadline, and included here out of goodwill and for completeness because of they express disagreement with the drafted policies which helps provide counterpoint and challenge for the Steering Committee to consider

Comments from feedback forms regarding the draft policies – September 2020

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The neighbourhood plan has the ability to control the design of their neighbourhoods through design codes. • Strongly agree and trust policies will be upheld • There are so many varied designs of property so hard to see how new ones can reflect their surrounding properties. So each must be on its own merit. We must preserve the few old properties in the village including the Nags Head even if that means allowing it to be a residential property.¹ • Designs needed to encourage some young families.¹
<p>4. Landscape, character & green space</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to try to find communal green space for events, meetings, etc. • Take into account that trees that are mature can cause structural problems and need removal. • The fields either side of Top Farm are no less important green space than other parts of the village. The lack of binaries in these fields increase the potential for large scale development and needs addressing. Initial infill schemes lead to backfill – as already seen elsewhere. Re draw the settlement boundary to prevent this. • Must maintained in keeping with a small rural village • Agree but item 4 not strictly necessary. Not all houses comply with this now. Also is the intent and wording clear? Should the gardens be big enough to accommodate a tree, or do you want a tree actually planted? Quite different. • The area for development on Church Street near Top Farm lack footpaths, is narrow. Other locations appear to have been discounted for development because of these limiting features, therefore Church Street should be treated the same. • Point 7 at odds with Section 2 6F. • The existing trees are of utmost importance and must be protected. • Greenspace is reduced too much with too many roadside areas being included for potential development. • Green space reduced too much. • But the green space should go right around the settlement area – why have some areas been left out? • I agree as far as this goes but it is incomplete in its consideration of the environment. It talks a great deal about trees but says barely anything about accommodation of wildlife when developing property compatible with the

Comments from feedback forms regarding the draft policies – September 2020

	<p>environment. The local fauna are as much a part of the character and charm of the village. Also, in proposing protected green spaces, we should not be removing those currently in the existing plan, such as the field immediately to the west of that marked 1 in the new plan.</p>
5. Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep as many trees as possible. Replant where suitable, minimise noise • Aging population means over the next 20 years many properties will change hands. Little/no need for more properties • Not all trees should be preserved. Some need removing. • Agreed. These points should be adhered to in the existing developments. Noise and pollution are currently unacceptable. • This seems totally over the top given the limited development suggested • Given the low level of development the policy is far too onerous
6. Sustainable Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No new build without proper improvement of roads, pavements and drains • Aging population means over the next 20 years many properties will change hands. Little/no need for more properties • Will developers really listen? • Surface water and lack of adequate road drainage is a big problem • We need to ensure this is actioned rather than given lip service • I think this is a particularly important area and could be in the village plan to improve the EXISTING houses • Developers should be required to set up a fund to contribute to the village • Development here would impact on failing infrastructure • Vague – a site <i>must</i> be drained
7. Village Amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure public Rights of Way are maintained • Obtain land for public space • Developers should contribute to village amenities. • Improve village hall facilities • Natural surroundings/environment – “beauty” is subjective • “Church and graveyard” – we don’t have a separate one

Comments from feedback forms regarding the draft policies – September 2020

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Although we would like to retain the pub, we would prefer it be residential rather than the eyesore it currently is.• Would welcome a pub or shop.• Pub and shop are unrealistic propositions in such a small community where parking WOULD be an issue.• Population of the village is too small to sustain the upkeep of a play area/area for fetes which would undoubtedly get rained off. Also too small for sustaining a shop/pub with no passing trade.• A village play area is not viable for so few people, and costs would be too high. Also encourages drugs and litter etc.• Could be increased by more use of village hall for different types of social gathering• Village Hall could be used more• Adequate parking is not demonstrated by current amenities and is not always possible for future use.• Paragraph 3 is of particular importance when considering the old nags head pub. “No parking disruption to neighbours and no safe pedestrian access.” A pub would contravene all these requirements.• A pub would only survive with lots of visitors from outside the village but there is no parking available on site for those visitors.• Street parking only available for a pub in Nags Head Lane or Elm Close.• The pub group misled ENC and provided no business plan and relied on buying the pub cheaply.• I strongly agree with paragraph 3• We do not want large car parking areas within the village – current amenities so not have any adverse effects currently• This should not include a public house• I agree only assuming this does not include a pub• The fact that quite rightly you insist on adequate parking seems to rule out retaining the Nags head as an amenity and I think it is time we accepted this and allow the current owner to move on.¹
--	--

Comments from feedback forms regarding the draft policies – September 2020

<p>8. Supporting rural diversification & employment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only if businesses are “friendly”, quiet and non-polluting • Any renewable energy developments? • Solar properties on properties are acceptable • No more wind turbines • I agree in part but qualify since the likes of windfarms and chicken farms would not be welcomed additions • “Sensitive development opportunities” needs better definition to avoid misunderstanding and argument in the future. • “Sensitive development” – needs further clarification • May have negative impact and increase traffic and parking problems • Whilst I agree with this in general, the language is very open to interpretation. • Please add “must not encourage increased traffic, especially transport vehicles” • As a small village we do not want any large commercial building with would increase the traffic through the village, because the traffic is currently already at an unacceptable level and dangerous.
<p>Other comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well done to everyone who has put the Hargrave Neighbourhood Plan together • All planning/liaison with CC must be transparent and well publicised to all village members at all times • Raunds is growing rapidly and its facilities are becoming inadequate • Raunds, Thrapston, Rushden, Higham Ferrers all have significant growth for this area but they have advantages of amenities and facilities. Hargrave Village DOES NOT. • The village settlement boundary as proposed could lead to large scale developments which an enormous majority of the village residents are opposed to. • With changes to the planning system there is potential for sites within the settlement boundary to be granted outline planning consent and require a less rigorous planning application (Growth/Renewal areas). In our opinion it would be more appropriate to keep as much as possible of Hargrave Village within the Protected designation to ensure planning applications operate in a similar manner to the current system. As such it is imperative that the correct areas for future development are identified or omitted at this stage to ensure the village retains its historic character and open landscape features so highly valued by its residents

Comments from feedback forms regarding the draft policies – September 2020

--	--