

**IRCHESTER, KNUSTON AND LITTLE IRCHESTER NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
STAGE 1 CONSULTATION
RESULTS – 17.07.14**

Total leaflets distributed: 2077. Total Responses = 378. This represents an 18% response rate.




QUESTION 1: There are three zones for development in Irchester: Northern, North-Eastern and Southern. Please rank zones in order of preference with Option 1 being your most preferred choice for development.

The majority of people answered this question. However, several people left all 3 options blank or specified that there should be no development. Others, chose to list only their 1st preference and no others, or only 1st and 2nd preference and no others.

The below shows how close the vote between the zones has been, with the vote for 1st preference divided almost equally between the 3 zones.

The table below shows a straight count of the votes:

	Ranking					
Site	1st	%age	2nd	%age	3rd	%age
Northern	104	28%	106	28%	97	26%
North-Eastern	118	31%	115	30%	75	20%
Southern	114	30%	76	20%	111	29%
Blank/'No Development'	42	11%	81	21%	95	25%
Total:	378	100%	378	100%	378	100%



And the reasons why...

Specific comments for and against the different zones were received. A **summary** of the most commonly recurring ones are as follows:

Northern Zone

By far the most commonly raised comment in support was the suggestion that this zone had easy access to the A45 and therefore would mean less traffic through the village. It was also commonly suggested that this site could enable improvements to the A45 junction, with several people suggesting a roundabout here.

Another commonly recurring comment was that this zone was closer to village amenities. Also that this zone presents the opportunity for sports land/ public open space.

Summary of Comments in support

- closer link to the A45 to get access in and out of the village, meaning less traffic going through village
- allows for additional space for POS [possible]/ sports land/ possible increase in leisure facilities
- less disruption to balanced village/ least impact on village and residents
- better access points
- will not change the character of the village or upset view of Church, it will just be an extension
- potential for access to A45 with a new roundabout, this site could enable delivery of new roundabout
- infill to village boundaries
- the least built up area of village
- least impact village character
- greater space available
- would involve less traffic via Wollaston Road
- A45 would stop spread
- closer to amenities of village centre
- least impact on spoiling views and open countryside
- offering more to the village than other sites
- little impact whilst under construction
- does not border so many private properties

Summary of Comments against

- the High Street will be used as shortcut by cars
- dangerous - traffic
- no bus route
- A45 junction is too dangerous
- grow crops on here
- extend village boundary/ spoil countryside
- less access/ negative impact on country park
- separate from village,
- spoil views, lose all rural feel of entry to village

North-Eastern Zone

The most commonly recurring comment in support was the feeling that this zone represented a more infilling/ natural continuation of the shape of the village, and would not impact the village boundary line as much. There was also support that this zone *could* include some brownfield development.

Other commonly raised comments were that this zone had better road connections, and that this would mean the least disruption to the village.

Summary of Comments in Support

- least damaging to village/ less disruption to main village
- infill to village boundaries/ natural continuation of village/ would not extend village boundary line/ less impact on shape of village
- small local development
- easiest site for traffic/ better road connections
- could use Parsons Hall and ground next to Austin Close
- cars would be able to get onto A45 without more traffic through village
- least likely to offend residents due to location
- allotments are eyesore, north east is an eyesore and would benefit from development
- more central to village, access to shops and village centre
- appears to be extension of Biscay Close
- north-east is less developed whereas others have more housing there
- opportunity to improve sewers
- would not have such an impact on countryside/ wildlife/ less environmental impact
- on bus route to Rushden,
- at least some of this zone is brownfield
- the residents have already made their views clear, by fighting and winning against other zones
- less visual impact
- will minimise sprawl, railway would stop spread
- less potential for very big development
- at least traffic will not be so dangerous with two access points

Summary of Comments Against

- too close to railway
- poor drainage/ sewer problem
- poor access
- extra cars in village centre
- more junctions on Station Rd would be dangerous
- allotments need retaining
- closing gap to Rushden
- spoil view for village
- overcrowding/ overdevelopment

Southern Zone

By far the most commonly raised reason for support was the suggestion that the zone has better access opportunities than other zones, and traffic from here was less likely to cause congestion in main part of village.

Similarly, a frequent comment was that this site would cause the least disruption to main/ old part of the village.

Comments in Support

- less congested/ better traffic flow/ traffic less likely to impact the village/ traffic less likely to use High Street
- more space and safety of children
- ease of access (Farndish Rd/ Wollaston Rd)
- cause least disruption away from centre of village/ on village character/ retains integrity of village
- least visual impact/ less damage to landscape
- keeps development away from school children
- flat land
- development could be screened by trees
- lose less public footpaths and green spaces
- adding to housing already there/ already modern houses here
- enables enough land for sports field, school/ enough land for additional facilities
- children could walk to Wollaston School
- not as much pressure onto current infrastructure
- homes would be an extension and blend in without losing village character
- less damage to older parts of village
- would encourage residents to use Wollaston services thereby ease pressure on Irchester
- has the option of two major road access

Comments Against

- extends village boundary/ spoils countryside
- would affect most people
- used a lot by villagers for country walks
- flooding
- already largest part of village
- already congestion at peak times along Farndish Rd and near Co-op
- grow crops on here
- potential for development to spread
- would have to use village centre to access all points
- poor access to site
- cause more traffic on Wollaston Road - danger to school children
- pipes and uneven ground
- most damaging to environment
- would make too big an estate
- only surrounded by minor roads

QUESTION 2: Do you have any additional suggestions as to where the required housing should go?

The below provides a summary of the alternatives suggested:

- site at end of Thrift Street
- must keep as village, fit in one or two houses where possible, convert the upper floor of the Co-op into flats
- Brownfield first: we need to use all pockets of land within the village first/ brownfield/keep within village boundaries/ infill building should be carried out on small plots within the village (10 comments)
- Little Irchester/ Gipsy Lane/ London Rd, Lt Irchester (3 comments)
- Parsons Hall estate (9 comments)
- why are you not building in Hinwick, Bozeat if all villages have to have new development
- Split across several sites (11 comments): e.g. housing should be here and there/ dividing the development up into 3 equal parts such that no one area takes the entire brunt/ small pockets in area preferred (e.g. allotment gardens - NE; brownfield site; majority of southern site)/ homes should be split between southern and north-eastern NOT northern/ southern and northern but smaller/ a few houses on smaller sites would be best/ development needs to be spread out/ dividing works between north east and southern/2 smaller sites totalling 75, one the northern site and one on the north-eastern side/ split the developments into smaller for north and south, small local development/ could there be smaller developments in each of the areas?
- some sites in NE zone, such as Parsons Hall, may be best options
- adjacent to the rear of the country park and Bradshaw Way
- possible gypsy campsite (3 comments)
- Land to left of Austin Close, Parsons Hall and land off Austin Close - least visual impact on landscape/ develop old allotments and Parsons Hall/ overgrown land to left of Austin Close/ part of NE zone - the old allotments/ extend the Arkwright estate towards the railway/ next to Austin [Close] Park behind Arkwright Estate/ Austin Close (7 comments)
- would have to avoid water conduit which goes underground across Farndish Road - if the housing was further up the hill, in a small plot to the rear of Arkwright Rd estate
- Wellingborough (11 comments)
- north side of A45
- to the east of the railway
- end of Thrift St = small blocks like Stringers Court; allotment gardens are derelict, Parsons Hall is virtually empty.
- Ditchford Lane area before lakes and housing would benefit from Rushden Lakes development
- Little Irchester, Wollaston, Bozeat
- Denton Close, Parsons Hall

- Further ribbon development between last house in London Rd and Gypsy Lane roundabout
- land next to Vicarage. Former play area - Arkwright Rd [Denton Close].
- Wollaston Rd side of southern field, not Farndish Rd.
- not in Irchester
- more to the road to Wollaston than to Farndish Rd.
- Working Men's Club
- In Irchester Rd A45 Area, north of the northern option to fill in up to A45.
- north of Wellingborough or closer to proposed Rushden expansion
- housing/ plots standing empty should be developed.
- Farndish
- old industrial sites not being used - in Rushden/Wellingborough
- build a road between railway bridge (b569) and low farm and there is plenty of routes out of the village for the extra traffic
- Wellingborough prison (2 comments)
- would like more detail why western end excluded
- field next to vicarage
- Town End Farm to A45
- disused properties
- plenty of land/ open space from the A509 to Wollaston Rd, and Gypsy Land down to A509
- north-eastern allotment lands which are currently and for last 20 years unused
- town end farm - after demolition order
- explore old factory sites, compulsory purchasing Coulon-style home owner initiatives sympathetic planning process for property sub-division cap on excessive house sizes.
- Denton Close
- Ranked: Chester Lodge, Rushden Road, Farndish Road
- south of Gypsy Lane
- only on Brownfield; only 50 houses max on the north-eastern
- the area between the railway and industrial site i.e. part of Knuston Lodge Farm access could also be simple from Irchester Bridge turning onto the A45
- southern development accessed via a roundabout on Wollaston Rd
- there is land opposite the southern site - next to the old landfill - a field that leads down to some ponds used for fishing. This would only affect the 1 house that is there
- fields by A509 in Little Irchester
- Little Irchester
- Station Road/ Parsons Hall
- alternative site south of Austin Close
- Parsons Hall/ land next to Austin Close
- because allotments are an eyesore
- new lakes development

- Northern - if at bottom of hill as in the original planning application - which also included additional playing fields
- Parsons Hall, then Station Road then Austin Close; Little Irchester off London Rd
- the eastern side of the village, between the north-eastern and southern zones
- land out towards Farndish
- closing the gap between Irchester and Rushden is the natural way to go plus the new shopping centre will come into play, new houses should be built near the lakes complex
- at least some of the north-eastern is brownfield
- fields nearer to the A45 of Irchester
- north-eastern along railway line
- Thrift Street scrap yard
- conversion above Co-op, the piece of land near to Manor Close, land near to Austin Close
- area between north-eastern and southern on the map
- Wollaston, near to senior school
- Station Road towards Rushden
- only for retirement homes

QUESTION 3: Do you think the Neighbourhood Plan should support additional development at Knuston and Little Irchester?

- 73% of the total respondents answered this question. The majority (56%) answered 'yes' that the neighbourhood plan should support additional development in Little Irchester and Knuston.
- 39% voted 'no'.
- 4% voted 'yes – but only in Little Irchester'.
- 1% voted 'yes – but only in Knuston'.

QUESTION 4: Do you have any concerns about the impact of housing? How could these concerns be addressed?

By far the most commonly raised concerns related to whether the present infrastructure could cope with additional population. In particular the following:



- Increased traffic and congestion
- Additional pressure on Schools and Health Facilities
- Impact on drainage

The second most commonly raised concerns related to impact on the character and status of the village as a village, and loss of countryside/ greenfield.

QUESTION 5: What type and size of housing should be given priority?

343 respondents answered this question, 90% of the total number of respondents. The majority indicated that more than one dwelling size and type should be given priority.

- The most frequently voted to be given priority were 3 bedroom dwellings (with 72% of people who answered this question indicating 3 bedroom should be given priority), followed by 2 bedroom dwellings.
- 62% of those who answered this question indicated affordable housing should be given priority
- 52% felt bungalows should be given priority, and 50% felt houses, compared to only 18% who indicated flats should be a priority for the area.



QUESTION 6: New development presents the opportunity for some improvements to local facilities in the area. Now is the time through the Neighbourhood Plan when you can have your say as to which benefits you want new housing to bring. What local facilities do you think need improving in the Plan area?

Rank these local facilities in order of your preference (1 to 9) – with ‘1’ being your most important and ‘9’ being your least important.

358 people answered this question – 94% of the total responses.

The facility most commonly voted as top priority (ranked 1st) was **Improvements to Health Services** (with 195 votes), followed by **Improvements to School** with 83 votes as top priority.

Lower down the rankings the picture is more mixed. However, commonly voted lower are improvements to community spaces (eg. meeting halls), and shops and pubs.


The following more detailed comments were frequently made in response to this question:

- Health Centre – a significant number of respondents made comment that this is currently inadequate, with exceptionally long waiting times. Suggestions for improvement were that it needs to be larger, with more doctors and health workers available, with quicker accessibility.
- Improvements to School – very important in the event of additional population, needs to be expanded, needs to be additional spaces. There were also frequent comments made that parking near the school needs to be improved.
- Provision of Sports Facilities – increase variety and inclusiveness of sports facilities, need better provision for young people
- Pedestrian Links – in particular, there were frequent requests that pedestrian/ cycle connectivity between Irchester and Wollaston be improved.
- It was frequently expressed that there were adequate shops/ pubs in the village.
- In terms of community meeting spaces – there were a lot of comments indicating there is adequate provision of community spaces in Irchester, albeit a considerable number of people suggested these needed upgrading.

The following issues were frequently raised under 'other':

- Improvements to condition of roads and pavement surfaces
- Better police presence
- Improved parking in village
- Improved road safety/ road improvements to deal with additional traffic
- Drainage/ capacity of sewerage system
- Need a Dentist
- Problems with litter

Ranked (with 1 being top priority)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total Counts
Improvements to School	83	108	45	23	17	15	17	12	27	347
Improvements to Health Services	195	65	23	12	8	9	9	4	22	347
Improvements to Sports/ Recreational Leisure Provision	22	24	42	46	65	50	40	31	22	341
Improvements to Community Spaces	10	18	31	45	52	61	55	46	21	338
Shops and Pubs	18	22	33	38	51	47	47	46	31	333
Public Transport	24	27	53	48	41	39	47	41	21	341
Pedestrian and Cycle Links	26	28	29	52	49	39	32	50	31	336
Public Green Spaces	31	27	39	35	50	31	49	49	22	332
Other	27	8	6	5	3	0	11	6	34	100



Answer Options	Improvements to School	Improvements to Health Services	Improvements to Sports/Leisure Provision	Improvements to Community Spaces	Shops and Pubs	Public Transport	Pedestrian and Cycle Links	Public Green Spaces	Other	Total
1	83	195	22	10	18	24	26	31	27	436
%age of priority 1 votes	19%	45%	5%	2%	4%	6%	6%	7%	6%	
2	108	65	24	18	22	27	28	27	8	327
%age of priority 2 votes	33%	20%	7%	6%	7%	8%	9%	8%	2%	
3	45	23	42	31	33	53	29	39	6	301
%age of priority 3 votes	15%	8%	14%	10%	11%	18%	10%	13%	2%	
4	23	12	46	45	38	48	52	35	5	304
%age of priority 4 votes	8%	4%	15%	15%	13%	16%	17%	12%	2%	
5	17	8	65	52	51	41	49	50	3	336
%age of priority 5 votes	5%	2%	19%	15%	15%	12%	15%	15%	1%	
6	15	9	50	61	47	39	39	31	0	291
%age of priority 6 votes	5%	3%	17%	21%	16%	13%	13%	11%	0%	
7	17	9	40	55	47	47	32	49	11	307
%age of priority 7 votes	6%	3%	13%	18%	15%	15%	10%	16%	4%	
8	12	4	31	46	46	41	50	49	6	285
%age of priority 8 votes	4%	1%	11%	16%	16%	14%	18%	17%	2%	
9	27	22	22	21	31	21	31	22	34	231
%age of priority 9 votes	12%	10%	10%	9%	13%	9%	13%	10%	15%	

