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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>1st %age</th>
<th>2nd %age</th>
<th>3rd %age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>104 28%</td>
<td>106 28%</td>
<td>97 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-Eastern</td>
<td>118 31%</td>
<td>115 30%</td>
<td>75 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>114 30%</td>
<td>76 20%</td>
<td>111 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank/‘No Development’</td>
<td>42 11%</td>
<td>81 21%</td>
<td>95 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>378 100%</td>
<td>378 100%</td>
<td>378 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ranked 1st

- Northern: 104 (28%)
- North-Eastern: 118 (31%)
- Southern: 114 (30%)
- Blank/‘No Dev’: 42 (11%)

Ranked 2nd

- Northern: 106 (28%)
- North-Eastern: 115 (30%)
- Southern: 76 (20%)
- Blank/‘No Dev’: 81 (22%)

Ranked 3rd

- Northern: 97 (26%)
- North-Eastern: 75 (20%)
- Southern: 111 (29%)
- Blank/‘No Dev’: 95 (25%)
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 by 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

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

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