

<p>Section Title - Braybrooke</p>
<p>Number of responses - 48</p> <p>Total number of Objections – 36 Total number of Support – 6 Total number of neither Object nor Support - 6</p>
<p>Summary of main points</p> <p>Historic England – BRA/02 would be strengthened by wording c) Sustain protect and enhance the <u>character and setting</u> of The Old Rectory Grade II Listed Building and the Conservation Area. (Id 418)</p> <p>NCC Archaeology – RA/128 - Be supported by an appropriate level of archaeological assessment (Id 315)</p> <p>Braybrooke Parish Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12.42 – it would be more accurate to say the historic core of the village is centred around the grade 2* listed church in the North (<i>other listed buildings are Bridge House, Wantage House, 2 Newton Way and the Road Bridge</i>) and the grade 2 listed Old Rectory in the South (<i>other listed buildings are Bleak House and Pipewell Cottage</i>). (Id 270) • The map omits the redevelopment of the Primary School and the two houses south-east of School Lane. (Id 270) • Parked cars are a significant visual feature in the village, especially down Griffin Road. Cars park on the pavement forcing pedestrians into the road. Enforcement is part of the answer but design/planning can make provision for off road parking. Problem should be noted in the plan and policies put in place to resolve it so future planning applications are forced to address the issue (Id 271) • A public meeting was attended by about 50 people focusing on the redrawing of the boundary to include RA/128. Majority objected to the proposal for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Safety concerns over the position of the proposed access on Griffin Road ○ Development of this site will not preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area and its setting. ○ Development of this site will detrimentally impact on the setting of the grade II listed Rectory ○ Absence of any housing allocation requirements or identified unsatisfied need. ○ Lack of local amenities and infrastructure. ○ Proximity to public house (one of only two community buildings in the village): potential for impacts on new residents from noise, and on viability of public house due to potential of noise complaints from new residents. ○ Impact on biodiversity of the site (Id 272) • A further response provided additional information objecting to the development of Top Orchard. The following is a summary of the

reasons:

- There is no need –no indication that the proposal will be developed for people working locally within the local rural economy or that they will provide housing to meet a local need. These 3 dwellings are not needed to meet the rural housing requirement as 170-171 houses identified in the plan exceeds 140 remaining requirement
- Character of the village – historical character is linear and this development would erode that
- Impact on the historic environment – historical approach to The Rectory was through the site. Redevelopment will impact the setting and ability to understand the historic evidential value of the Rectory, and therefore its significance. Impact on the character of the Conservation Area
- Access into the site – Vehicles would not be able to pass at the entrance, existing parking issues, blind bend, trees would need to be removed and junction put in impacting on the character of the conservation area
- Amenity – proximity of pub will impact on amenity of new residents
- Services and facilities – Braybrooke has limited local services school and shop have closed, surgery in Desborough no longer taking patients
- Ecology – site has been unmanaged for a large number of years and has become a significant area for wildlife, including bats. Not enough understood about the biodiversity value of the site to enable it to be allocated for housing (Id 565)

Settlement Boundary

Object

- Boundary should not be redrawn/ extended (Id 145) (Id 370) (Id 530)
- 2013 consultation on the village boundary has been ignored (Id 145)
- No growth option should be maintained. Boundary around RA/128 should not be changed (Id 176)
- 1993 Local Plan excluded all sites that would have extended the boundary. KBC and an Inspector refused an application on RA/128 that same year. Development of RA/128 would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and on the special interest of the neighbouring Grade II Listed Building (Id 176)
- Dissatisfied by lack of resistance from LPA to unneeded and unwanted development in rural villages (264)
- Residents should be empowered but subjected to behind-closed-doors decision making (264)
- No justified need for the development (264) (Id 373)
- Inclusion of RA/128 is at odds with the principles for drawing the boundary. RA/128 is open space at the edge of the settlement, is visually open and relates to the open countryside rather than the settlement (Id 377)
- Why is change being considered again when it has been refused

several times, including by Planning Inspectors (1) (Id 527)

General Development

Object

- Village has increased by nearly 11% in last 2 years not including homes/ sites for the travelling community (Id 145)
- There is no village specific quota, Braybrooke has already taken 14 plus 2 others difficult to see where the proposed allocation of 3 comes from/ No identified need for additional housing (Id 223) (Id 241) (Id 373)
- Para 12.45 – consultation quoted appears to have been undertaken wholly within the Council, no one attending the village meeting was aware of these consultations. Where is states ‘subsequently agreed’ – by whom (Id 224)
- Rural Masterplanning – this refers only to a need for affordable housing which has been met (Id 224)
- Strong objection to the 2013 consultation, progressing this site flies in the face of policy and vision statements about empowering communities/ Council has ignored the community (Id 247) (Id 373)

Neither

- 12.45 – consultation is only meaningful if significant number of people air their views (360)
- Through consultations majority of villagers favoured no growth option, who agreed draft housing allocation? (360)

Site RA/128/ BRA02

Support

- Village has employment opportunities, high speed broadband, good infrastructure and a regular bus service (Id 121) (Id 122) (Id 123)
- Previous developments have sold quickly indicating demand (Id 121) (Id 122) (Id 123)
- Land is available, has good access and it not overlooked. The Beech tree is an asset to development (Id 121) (Id 122) (Id 123)

Object

- Do not believe development will be restricted to 3 dwellings, developer would want to maximise their profit/ Council can't guarantee there would only be 3 (Id 145) (Id 147) (Id 373)
- Access – cars park in this area when using the pub/ village hall, cars coming out the entrance would increase accident risk/ vehicular assess to Griffin Road is dangerous / within 100 yards of dangerous blind bend/ visibility splays would be non-existent/ application on opposite side of the road refused because too near Griffin Road/School Lane/ PH junction/ would not meet the requirements of the NPPF/ adverse impact on vehicle, pedestrian and cycle safety/ traffic would increase (Id 145) (Id 147) (Id 186) (Id 187) (Id 471) (Id 205) (Id 219) (Id 221) (Id 226) (Id 232) (Id 264) (Id 373) (Id 374) (Id 511) (Id 529) (Id 530)
- Access to the site during the building process will be a nightmare (1) (Id 530)

- NCC note for Developers, Highway Engineers and Planners states the length of a shared drive between the dwelling and the public highway should not exceed 45m. This would be exceeded and allocation should be removed (Id 220)
- NCC Highway Development Management Strategy, Policy DM15 – NCC don't allow more than 5 dwellings to be served by a private drive, no guarantee developer won't push to increase the development to 5 dwellings (Id 220)
- Who will maintain the access (374)
- Question need for and support of additional housing in the village. Sale of properties in village has been difficult for some years (Id 176)
- Families will not come to a village with no school and surrounded by uncertainty aroused by illegal traveller sites (Id 176)
- Desborough surgery is no longer accepting patients from Braybrooke (Id 176)
- Amenities/ facilities have disappeared/ only a pub/ unsustainable location/ contrary to JCS (School, shop, post office) (Id 220) (Id 373)
- Development would have detrimental impact on the Conservation Area and special interest of the neighbouring Grade II Listed Building / adjacent to Conservation Area/ Listed building/ access would impact on the Old Rectory (Id 225) (Id 374) (Id 511)
- Old Rectory should not overlook a building site (Id 530)
- Views from the Jurassic Way would be adversely affected (Id 511)
- Row of Lime Trees between the site and the pub felled recently. Old Rectory now sensitised to the vulnerability of trees on RA/128 (Id 225)
- The Copper Beech which has a TPO will be effected by the development (Id 225) (Id 374)
- RA/128 is vital part of habitat of local wildlife being not built on or farmed. Bats and Great Crested Newts seen on or near to the site (Id 225)
- Southern – part of the site is just as sensitive as the northern part and should not be developed (Id 176)
- Development would be “backland” development (Id 186) (Id 187)
- Because it is backland, development would not be in keeping with village character, which goes against JCS 11, 2b (Id 218)
- Proximity of the pub unlikely to provide the owners with quiet enjoyment of their properties/ adversely impacted by noise and cooking smell (Id 471) (Id 220) (Id 264)
- Negative impact on amenity of neighbouring properties (Id 221)
- Infrastructure of village unsuitable to take further development (Id 471)
- Proposal is outside village envelope and local residents have stated overwhelmingly that the envelope should be respected (Id 471)
- Would not be in keeping with character of the area, goes against JCS 11, 2b/ would affect open nature of the village/ open land at the edge of the settlement which is visually separated from the settlement with its characteristic linear development (Id 232) (Id 264) (Id 377)
- Not in keeping with village's existing spinal structure (Id 221)
- Summary of the Housing Allocations – Assessment of Additional Sites and Update consultation was skewed and went against public views

given (Id 218)

- Wishes of residents expressed through 2013 consultation not taken into account/ residents should be empowered but subjected to behind-closed-doors decision making (Id 147) (Id 264)
- Planning inspectorate refused an appeal on the site, reasons still apply (Id 220)
- No demonstrable need for additional housing in the village (Id 221) (Id 264) (Id 529) (Id 530)
- Expanding the village boundary to include BRA02 will have a detrimental effect on the open nature of the village (Id 232)
- SHLAA found the site 'performing poorly in terms of accessibility, with major constraints to the provision of water and sewerage infrastructure which would be difficult to overcome (Id 225)
- BRA02 – Criteria c) – RA/128 slopes uphill to the south so any development will affect outlook and presence of the Old Rectory more than if flat (Id 226)
- Dissatisfied by lack of resistance from LPA to unneeded and unwanted development in rural villages (Id 264)
- Residents of the proposed houses would be adversely affected by their proximity to the sewage treatment works, the site lies within 400m exclusion radius (Id 264)
- Impact on amenity of adjacent properties (Id 530)
- Impact of noise and traffic during building (Id 530)
- Additional sewerage flow would add to already overloaded and frequently problematic sewer in Griffin Road (Id 264)
- If it is unavoidable that 3 houses need to be built then this location is better than anywhere else in the village. The current site detracts visually from the appearance of the village. If the development is permitted BRA02 must be strictly enforced, especially the yield. The existing mature trees along the boundary should be protected by TPO's before inclusion of the allocation (Id 264)
- An additional criteria relating to biodiversity should be included within BRA02 to preserve areas of natural grassy meadow and all perimeter hedgerows and trees and to include the construction of a suitable SUDs pond to provide and protect habitats (Id 264)
- Planning Inspector and KBC have both refused applications for this and other sites which would change the village boundary (Id 511)
- Concern the requirements relating to the proposal will not be adhered to; Beech tree should already be being protected but this isn't happening, trees and planting already removed from part of the site (Id 529)
- Who would be responsible for the open space? (Id 529) (530)

Neither

- BRA02 – Condition about access would require resolving the parking problem by providing more parking spaces for pub customers. Providing this could be done as an enforceable condition this would be supported, if not development is unthinkable (Id 273)

BRA01

Object

- No established need north of the river so should be no development proposals whatsoever (Id 146)
- Development of RA/128 will not protect and enhance the character of the Conservation Area and its setting (Id 528)

Local Green Space

- Agree with HVI006 –however needs to make clear this is privately owned with no public access (Id 68) (Id 67)
- Support but concerned garden land has been included (Id 387)
- RA/128 should be designated as Historically and Visually Important Open Space (1)

Other

- Map doesn't show 14 houses at the school site (Id 68) (Id 67) (Id 145) (id 176) (Id 222) (Id 370) (Id 527) (530)
- Map doesn't show the 2 properties down School Lane (Id 145)
- Request for housing needs survey 2014 – 2013 survey did not identify any need for development (Id 148)
- Housing need survey need met by school development (Id 148) (Id 207) (Id 527)
- Table 12/4 is incorrect – 14 houses on old school site, 2 behind School Lane, 1 on Newland Street, where there are three existing commitments (Id 155)
- Information is out of date in relation to the number of new houses built. 14 properties on the School site and 2 properties off School Lane (Id 511)
- Appears to have been some favouring of villages in terms of allocating sites. Braybrooke has been treated differently to Grafton Underwood when comparing levels of objection and deciding how to proceed (Id 220)
- Para 12.42 contains errors regarding layout of the village (Id 222)
- Para 12.42 – There are not 'many' listed buildings and these are evenly distributed to north and south of the river (Id 527)

Implications of New National Planning Policy Framework

Refer to this section in the 'Rural Area' chapter summary sheet.

Summary of officer comments

Policy BRA02 will be amended as requested by Historic England.

A criterion will be added to BRA02 requiring development to be supported by an appropriate level of archaeological assessment.

Paragraph 12.42 will be updated to reflect comments from Braybrooke Parish

Council

The map is a base map produced by Ordnance Survey; the Council is not able to update this base map. However the Council is fully aware of the level of development which has taken place in Braybrooke and this has been taken into account when preparing the plan.

Policy 8 of the Joint Core Strategy requires proposals to make provision for parking, however additional text will be added to the SSP2 highlighting this as an issue and criteria will be added to policies BRA01 and BRA02 to require adequate parking provision in new developments.

Settlement Boundary

The results of the 2013 consultation on the settlement boundary are noted, however the views of residents need to be balanced alongside the need to meet housing requirements set out in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which identifies a requirement of 480 dwellings in the rural area 2011-2031.

While the settlement boundary criteria exclude open spaces at the edge of settlements they do include new allocations within the settlement boundary.

The settlement boundary criteria have been amended since 2012 in response to comments made to the SSPLDD Issues Paper Consultation. The criteria now include new allocations within the settlement boundary, with the exception of new allocations for affordable housing.

While decisions in the past have been made to refuse development on the site, the site has been promoted for development and has therefore been assessed against a set of criteria, alongside other sites.

Need for development

The need for development in the rural area is identified in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which sets a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. The Housing Needs Assessment only identifies the need for affordable housing.

Views of local resident are noted; however the views of residents need to be balanced alongside the need to meet housing requirements set out in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

Given the scale of development proposed, the local amenities and infrastructure are considered adequate.

The site in Braybrooke needs to be considered alongside other sites which have been considered for development across the rural area. The Council

needs to ensure that the plan identifies the most suitable sites to meet the rural housing requirement when considered against alternatives.

While the draft plan identifies sites which would deliver in excess of the 140 dwelling required to meet the JCS requirement this currently provides a small buffer in case any of the sites identified do not come forward.

The consultations referred to in paragraph 12.45 were the consultation of the Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document Options Paper (2012) and the Housing Allocations – Assessment of Additional Sites and Update consultation (2013) both these consultations were public consultations at earlier stages in the preparation of the Draft Plan. The subsequent agreement to designate sites was made by the Council's Planning Policy Committee.

Site RA128

Full detail of the proposed access to the site would be considered through a planning application; however NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed by a shared drive. This means that access would require minimal or no mitigation.

There are already 2 dwellings accessed from an existing access, therefore if the status as a private drive remains then only 3 additional dwellings could be added to conform to NCC highways requirements.

When a private drive exceeds 45m, NCC policy sets out specific requirements that need to be met. They relate to access for the Fire Service. The requirements would affect the layout of development and the design of the access route. These are issues which would be dealt with at planning application stage rather than at site allocation stage.

The proposal is for the site to be accessed by a private drive, the maintenance of the drive would therefore be the responsibility of the developer/ future occupiers of the site.

The new development will not add to on-street parking in Griffin Road, the properties are expected to be provided with sufficient parking to meet their own need. It would be inappropriate to require a development proposal to either address the existing issue of parking and enforcement, or restrict the occupants from using the public highway, along with other users.

The assessment for this site took into account the impact of development on the Conservation Area and Listed Building. To mitigate this impact a requirement has been added to the policy for this site to ensure that development would enhance the setting of the Listed Building and

Conservation Area.

Any impact of construction would only take place during the construction period.

Noise/ disruption would be limited to the period during which any development is being constructed.

Criteria (g) of Policy BRA02 seeks to ensure that there is no negative impact on neighbouring properties in terms of amenity.

It is not uncommon for pubs to be located in residential areas. Environmental Health officers have been consulted through the site assessment process and had not identified any issues in relation to this site.

The Beech tree is protected by a Tree Preservation Order and any development on the site would be required to protect and enhance the tree. The proposed policy also requires that the setting of Grade II Old Rectory and Conservation Area are protected and enhanced.

An additional criterion will be added requiring an ecological survey be undertaken to identify the presence of wildlife in the area, to help understand mitigation necessary.

Draft policy BRA02 seeks to maintain the open character of the site through the provision of an area of open space in the northern part of the site. Development would be within the southern part of the site which is located behind existing properties on Griffin Road.

Officers have developed a set of development criteria which will address the issues raised and ensure that the development does not have an unacceptable impact on the community.

While the proposed development would be located to the rear of properties on Griffin Road, it would have built development on two sides. With careful design this site could provide a logical extension to the village which doesn't impact on the character of the village.

An additional criterion will be added to the policy requiring archaeological assessment.

The policy would allocate the site for 3 dwellings. The site has a number of constraints, including the Beech Tree and the access which is by a shared private drive which means the yield for the site has been reduced down to 3.

The site is not within the 400m cordon sanitaire.

Anglian Water has been consulted through the site assessment work and no

issues have been raised in relation to the capacity of the sewer.

Infrastructure providers have been consulted through the site assessment process and no overriding constraints have been identified in relation to this site.

Support for RA/128 is noted.

Local Green Space

Additional text will be added to the Pre-submission plan to clarify that Local Green Space is not necessarily publicly accessible.

The Local Green Space designation doesn't change the existing use of land which is often private land; however it restricts future development on the land which would only be considered acceptable in very special circumstances.

Other

The map is a base map produced by Ordnance Survey; the Council is not able to update this base map. However the Council is fully aware of the level of development which has taken place in Braybrooke and this has been taken into account when preparing the plan.

All sites have been considered using the same set of criteria. Those which have been assessed as most favourable against the assessment criteria are the ones which have been identified in the draft SSP2.

Next steps

- Amend criteria (c) of policy BRA01
- Add criteria to policy BRA02 requiring ecological assessment and mitigation.
- Amend paragraph 12.42 to reflect comments regarding the historic core of the village.
- Add criteria and text to policy BRA01 to cover parking issues and a criteria to policy BRA02 to require adequate parking provision.
- Add criteria to policy BRA02 to address archaeological assessment.
- Add additional text to the Pre-submission Plan to clarify that Local Green Space is not necessarily publicly accessible.