



Appeal Decision

Inquiry opened on 19 February 2013

Site visit made on 22 February 2013

by John Felgate BA (Hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 5 June 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/H2835/A/12/2182431

Site A: Land West of High Street, Irchester, Northants

Site B: Land off Alfred Street, Irchester, Northants

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miss J P Redden, Mr R E Redden and Barwood Strategic Land LLP against the decision of the Borough Council of Wellingborough.
 - The application Ref WP/2012/0165/OM, dated 23 March 2012, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2012.
 - The development proposed is "erection of up to 124 dwellings (including affordable homes) and new medical centre, together with use of additional land for sport and recreation".
-

DECISION

1. The appeal is dismissed.

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

The inquiry

2. The inquiry sat on 19 - 21 February and 8 March 2013. Closing submissions were made in writing, and the inquiry was formally closed on 19 March.

The appeal sites

3. The appeal relates to two separate pieces of land, both adjoining the village of Irchester.
4. The proposed housing and medical centre would be located on approximately 5.3 ha of land, to the west of Chester Road¹, just to the north (not the west, as stated on the appeal form) of Nos 119 and 123 High Street. This site is referred to here as Site A.
5. The proposed use of land for sport and recreation relates to a parcel of about 2.8 ha of land immediately to the north of the Irchester Sports Association's existing sports ground, off Alfred Street, referred to here as Site B.

The nature of the permission sought

6. The application is expressed as an application for outline planning permission, with all detailed matters reserved except for access.

¹ There was some discussion at the inquiry as to whether Site A should be described as adjoining the High Street or Chester Road. From the numbering on the Ordnance Survey, the last numbered property in the High Street is No 134. In the absence of any other indication, it seems most likely that Chester Road begins from that point. I have therefore taken it that Site A's frontage is to Chester Road.

7. The application is accompanied by an indicative master plan for the proposed development on Site A (Drawing No. EDP1270/56), which includes details of the proposed accesses to that site. In so far as this drawing also shows details relating to matters other than access, it is agreed that these are to be treated as illustrative only.
8. In the case of Site B, since the application is for a use of land rather than operational development, permission cannot be granted in outline. I have treated this part of the appeal as seeking full permission for the change of use.

Section 106 agreement

9. The appeal is accompanied by a completed Section 106 legal agreement, which provides for the payment of various financial contributions, the implementation of the submitted Travel Plan, and the provision of 30% of the proposed dwellings as affordable housing. The contributions include formula-based sums towards community centre facilities, primary school education, environmental improvements, fire and rescue services, libraries, offsite open space, and public transport, plus fixed contributions towards footpath improvements and fire hydrants.
10. Paragraph 3.4 of the agreement provides that, if any of the obligations is found not to comply with the relevant Regulations², that obligation shall be severed from the deed without affecting the enforceability of the remainder. However, none of the submissions before me disputes the need for any of these obligations, or their reasonableness and relevance. In the light of the evidence presented at the inquiry, I consider that the obligations in the agreement meet the tests in the Regulations.
11. The Council confirmed at the inquiry that the agreement overcomes Refusal Reason No 4 (RR4).

Revocation of the Regional Strategy

12. On 12 April 2013, after the close of the inquiry, the Regional Strategy (RS) for the East Midlands was revoked. The Regional Strategy included the East Midlands Regional Plan published in March 2009, and the Part A Statement of the Milton Keynes & South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy published in March 2005, so far as the latter related to the East Midlands region.
13. The Government's intention to revoke the Strategy was drawn to the attention of the parties during the inquiry, and submissions regarding this matter were made at that time. I am satisfied that the effects of the revocation have been fully taken into account in the submissions and other evidence before me.

Council's legal submissions

14. During the inquiry, the Council advanced legal submissions to the effect that the publicity given to the application had been misleading, and that consequently any grant of planning permission would be unfair and unlawful. I deal with these submissions later in this decision, under the heading of 'other matters'.

² Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 ('the CIL Regulations')

PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

The development plan

15. The development plan for the area now comprises the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy adopted in June 2008; and the saved policies of the Wellingborough Local Plan, adopted in 1999, with an Alteration adopted in 2004.

The North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy, 2008

16. The Core Spatial Strategy (the CSS), prepared by the North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit (NNJPU), covers the four local authority districts of Corby, East Northants, Kettering and Wellingborough.
17. The plan seeks to meet North Northamptonshire's housing and employment needs up to 2021. The main aim of the strategy, as set out in Policy 1 and elsewhere, is to make the area more self-sufficient, and to deliver economic prosperity. To this end, the plan seeks to strengthen network of settlements, by directing most development to three designated growth towns, where a series of sustainable urban extensions (SUEs) are planned, followed by six named smaller towns. Irchester is not included amongst any of these identified locations.

The Wellingborough Local Plan, 1999/2004

18. In the Wellingborough Local Plan (WLP) Policies G4 and G5 define three types of villages: 'limited development', 'restricted infill' and 'restraint' villages. Irchester is in the restricted infill category, where development within the village boundary may be permitted, provided it would not adversely affect the size, form, character or setting of the village or its environs. However, the appeal sites are outside the village boundary.
19. In the countryside, development is severely restrained by Policies G6 and H4, amongst others.

National Policy

20. National policy is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF or 'The Framework'). The Framework emphasises the desirability of encouraging sustainable development.
21. Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, Paragraph 14 advocates that planning permission should normally be granted, unless the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, assessed against the policies of the Framework as a whole.
22. With effect from March 2013, Paragraph 215 advocates that the weight to be given to development plan policies should depend on their degree of consistency with the Framework.

Emerging plans and policies

Site Specific Proposals DPD, Preferred Options 2010

23. The Site Specific Proposals (SSP) Preferred Options document was published for consultation in 2010. The document sought to identify potential sites for

housing and other uses to meet the requirements of the adopted CSS. The responses included an objection from Irchester Parish Council to any development outside the village boundary.

24. Since 2011, the SSP has not progressed any further. From the evidence at the inquiry, it appears that it is unlikely now to be taken forward at least until the CS Review is adopted or nearing adoption. The document presently available therefore represents an early stage in a process which is subject to unresolved objections, and which, if it continues at all, is quite likely to have to start again from scratch.
25. Consequently, having regard to Paragraph 216 of the Framework, it seems to me that little weight can be attached to the draft SSP at the present time.

The North Northants Joint CS Review, 'Emerging Draft for Consultation', Aug 2012

26. A draft review of the CSS (the CS Review)³ was published for initial public consultation in August 2012. The draft plan includes proposed housing provisions up to 2031. Two alternative levels are indicated, the first being a minimum requirement and the second a higher level which includes an optional 'strategic' element. The proposed figures are significantly lower than those for the corresponding period in the adopted CSS.
27. The responses to this consultation were reported to the Joint Planning Committee in November 2012. These include what are described in the officers' report as strong objections from some respondents regarding the proposed housing provisions. In response to those objections, the NNJPU resolved in January 2013 to revise the housing figures, but the revised figures have not yet appeared in any new draft plan or been the subject of any public consultation.
28. The programme reported to the NNJPU in March 2013, envisages that the next consultation will take place during February and March 2014, and the plan will then be finalised for submission in May of that year, with a public examination to follow sometime thereafter. The plan is therefore still at an early stage, and appears to be subject to significant unresolved objections.
29. For these reasons, the draft CS Review carries little weight in the present appeal.

Irchester Neighbourhood Plan

30. Irchester Parish was designated as a Neighbourhood Area on 4 December 2012. A Neighbourhood Plan steering group has been set up by the Parish Council, and work on the draft plan is currently under way, but no draft proposals have yet been published.

MAIN ISSUES

31. At the inquiry, the Council confirmed that the objections set out in RRs 1 and 2 were intended to relate to the development proposed on Site A only. This stance was not challenged by any other objectors, and I have dealt with the proposals for Site B on the basis that these objections do not apply to that part of the scheme.

³ The Draft CS Review is also referred to in some of the evidence as the Draft JCS

32. Also during the inquiry, the Council and the appellants tabled a joint statement in which it was agreed that the Council did not intend to pursue any objections to either site relating to the effects on landscape character, visual amenity or village form and character. Nevertheless, in the case of Site A, these matters are raised by other objectors, and are therefore still before me.
33. In the light of all the evidence presented, both at the inquiry and in writing, it seems to me that the main issues in the appeal are now as follows:
- Whether there is a 5-year supply of housing land in the district;
 - Whether the development would be premature in relation to the emerging CS Review or the proposed Neighbourhood Plan;
 - Whether the development would accord with relevant policies relating to the pattern and location of development in the district;
 - The development's effects on the character and appearance of the countryside and the setting of the village;
 - The effects of the proposed development at Site A on traffic conditions and safety in Chester Road;
 - The effects of the development at Site B on traffic conditions and safety at Alfred Street;
 - And whether Site A is a suitable location for the proposed medical centre, having regard for the convenience and safety of pedestrian movements.

INSPECTOR'S REASONING

Housing land supply

NPPF policy on the 5-year supply

34. Paragraph 47 of the Framework emphasises the need to boost the supply of housing significantly. Local Plans should meet the full, objectively assessed housing needs of the area, and should identify a supply of sites, including specific, deliverable sites for at least 5 years' worth against that requirement. Paragraph 49 states that policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date unless a 5-year supply can be demonstrated.

5-year supply based on the adopted CSS

35. In the adopted CSS, the Borough of Wellingborough's overall housing requirement for the period 2001-21 is 12,800 dwellings. Under the phasing provisions of Policy 7 and Table 3, the requirement for the first 12 years of that period, up to 31 March 2013, was 5,946 dwellings.
36. From the AMR⁴, completions up to that date are estimated to have been 3,193 dwellings, equating to less than 54% of the requirement. There is therefore a 46% shortfall over the period 2001-13, amounting to 2,753 dwellings. The residual requirement over the remaining 8 years of the plan period, to 2021, is 9,607 units.
37. The AMR identifies a forward land supply, deliverable within the next 5 years, of only 2,231 dwellings. This includes sites with planning permission, sites allocated in the adopted LP and in the Wellingborough Town Centre Plan, and

⁴ The North Northants Area Annual Monitoring Report 2011-12: NNJPU, January 2013

draft allocations in the emerging SSP and CS Review. Taking into account also the Framework's requirement for a 20% buffer because of past under-delivery⁵, the AMR calculates that this amounts to 1.53 years' supply. The Council does not dispute this figure.

38. The appellants contend, for a number of reasons, that even this figure exaggerates the supply. I agree with them that it is wrong to include sites which have not yet progressed beyond being allocated in a draft plan. The exclusion of this category would reduce the supply by a further 276 units, bringing the 5-year supply figure down to around 1.3 years. With regard to the appellants' other arguments, including those relating to the 'Sedgefield method', sites without planning permission, a non-implementation allowance, and issues relating to the SUEs, I agree that these are all matters which could be debated at some length; however, for the purposes of the present appeal it is unnecessary to pursue these points further, since the conclusion to be drawn is already clear from the above figures.
39. I conclude that, based on the adopted CSS, the maximum land supply which can currently be demonstrated is no more than about 1.3 years. In the context of the Framework's policies on housing, this represents a serious shortage of deliverable land.

Whether to use the draft CS Review figures

40. The Council argues that the land supply position based on the newly emerging draft CS Review should be used in preference to the adopted CSS. I fully understand the reasons for that view. The adopted CSS was based on the regional housing provisions of the East Midlands RS, which included a major growth area based on Milton Keynes and the South Midlands, including parts of Northamptonshire. As a consequence, the CSS figures for Wellingborough and the rest of North Northants included a significant element of in-migration from the South East and other regions. That policy was intended to relieve some of the pressure in areas of high housing demand, and to take advantage of the strong national economy of the last decade to stimulate economic growth in Northamptonshire. With the subsequent downturn, it has proved difficult for the North Northants districts to meet these housing targets. Consequently, the Council argues that the CSS provisions for Wellingborough are now out-of-date.
41. In the Council's opinion, the adopted CSS housing figures are the legacy of an outdated and discredited system of top-down, centralised regional planning which, under the Localism Act 2011, is now in the process of being dismantled. Because the original RS targets were over-ambitious, they are no longer achievable, and continuing to pursue them can only result in unnecessary harm. The figures in the emerging CS Review, on the other hand, are based on an assessment of local needs and aspirations. They are therefore, in the Council's view, a better reflection of the aims expressed in the Framework, where the emphasis is on setting targets that are locally based and locally determined. The CS Review also takes account of more up-to-date information, including the latest census data and population and household projections.
42. I appreciate the strongly-held nature of the Council's view on these matters. Their position is also supported by large numbers of the Irchester residents,

⁵ As advised at Paragraph 47 of the Framework

Councillors, and other objectors who have made their views known, including the local Member of Parliament. However, none of these arguments changes my view that the draft CS Review is still at a very early stage. At present, the only draft that has been published as such is the August 2012 version, which was clearly no more than an initial consultation, and indeed was described in the document itself as a 'work in progress'. The housing figures in that draft were the subject of substantial objections. It is not yet known whether the changes that have subsequently been agreed by the NNJPU will overcome those objections, but the fact that changes are to be made clearly undermines any argument for relying on the original draft.

43. As noted earlier, although new figures were agreed by the NNJPU in March, those figures have not yet appeared in any draft plan, and have not been subject to any consultation. Before the draft CS Review can go forward for submission, it must be subject to at least one more round of public consultation. After that, it must be independently tested through the public examination process, and at that stage, it will be necessary for the NNJPU authorities to show that the housing provisions meet the district's full, objectively assessed needs. That must also include demonstrating compliance with the new duty under the Localism Act to co-operate with neighbouring authorities. The issues to be dealt with in the examination will inevitably be complex. I cannot speculate as to the outcome of this process, but it would not be unusual for any plan to undergo further changes before its final adoption. For all these reasons, the draft CS Review cannot yet carry significant weight.
44. The adopted CSS, in contrast, remains in force as part of the statutory development plan, and as such it must be the starting point for my decision, as a matter of law. The adopted plan was examined and found sound only five years ago, which is not a long time in the context of the timescales needed for plan making. I accept that some of the relevant circumstances have now changed, but that does not mean that the adopted plan should be disregarded altogether. Nor does it necessarily mean that the underlying housing needs on which the plan was based have disappeared. Those propositions remain to be tested in the context of the emerging draft plan. Nothing has yet taken the place of the adopted CSS, and in the meantime that plan remains the only authoritative basis on which to assess the district's housing requirements.

Conclusion on housing land supply

45. I conclude that, for the purposes of the present appeal, the 5-year land supply should be calculated on the requirements of the adopted CSS. On that basis, the district has, at best, a supply of 1.3 years. This represents a serious shortfall, conflicting with the Framework's aim to significantly boost housing supply. In the light of this shortfall, the provision of 124 units of housing, as now proposed, is a significant benefit, to which I give substantial weight.

Prematurity in relation to emerging plans

46. The Council's RR1 suggests that the proposed development would be premature and prejudicial in relation to the outcome of the CS Review and the Irchester Neighbourhood Plan.
47. The Secretary of State's guidance on the question of prematurity is contained within '*The Planning System: General Principles*', issued in 2005, which remains

extant. That advice states that a refusal of permission on grounds of prematurity may be justifiable where a proposed development is so substantial, or where the cumulative effect would be so significant, that granting permission could prejudice the emerging plan by predetermining the scale, location or phasing of development which are to be addressed in the plan. Otherwise, refusal on prematurity grounds will not usually be justified. In addition, where a plan is at the consultation stage, with no early prospect of submission for examination, refusal on prematurity grounds will seldom be justified, because of the delay that such a decision would cause in determining the land's future.

Prematurity in relation to the CS Review

48. With regard to the draft CS Review, as discussed above, the plan is only at the first consultation stage, and is unlikely to be submitted for examination for about a year. The final outcome of the process is likely to take at least a further six months after that. A dismissal of the appeal on grounds of prematurity would therefore effectively delay a final decision on the development for at least 18 months. In the context of the housing land shortfall that I have identified, such a delay is clearly undesirable.
49. Furthermore, the 124 dwellings proposed in the appeal scheme represent only about 2% of the plan's likely overall housing provision, even based on the draft plan's minimum figure of 5,700 dwellings. The allocation of sites within this size range seems most likely to be through the SSP, or some other DPD, or in neighbourhood plans, rather than in the CS Review itself. The appeal scheme would therefore not be likely, either on its own or cumulatively, to prejudice significantly any decisions to be taken in the CS Review.
50. In the light of the above guidance therefore, the effects on the emerging CS Review do not justify dismissing the appeal on prematurity grounds.

Prematurity in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan

51. In the case of the proposed Neighbourhood Plan, I accept that in the context of a village the size of Irchester, 124 dwellings is a significant number. Granting permission for the appeal scheme might therefore predetermine the outcome of some of the decisions which local people would prefer to see dealt with through the Neighbourhood Plan. However, although work has started on the plan, and there is evidently considerable enthusiasm in the village for the neighbourhood planning process, there is as yet no draft plan, and apparently no firm timetable for its production.
52. If the Neighbourhood Plan is to be in conformity with the CS Review, its timing must inevitably be dependent on that plan. For the reasons set out above, it seems to me that likely to be some time before the CS Review reaches a stage where it can be relied on. This seems likely to push the Neighbourhood Plan back, at least into the second half of 2014, and possibly later. If decisions regarding development proposals were to be put off until then, there would be a serious risk of adversely affecting the performance of the local economy, and allowing the housing shortfall to continue.
53. Consequently, notwithstanding the importance that the Localism Act gives to neighbourhood planning, it seems to me that in this case any potential prejudice to the Irchester Neighbourhood Plan is outweighed by the desirability of making a clear decision on the present proposal now.

Conclusion on prematurity

54. In the circumstances, I conclude that the dismissal of the appeal on grounds of prematurity would not be justified.

Effects on the pattern of development in the district

55. Within the Borough of Wellingborough, CSS Policy 10 and Table 5 seek to direct most of the district's development to Wellingborough itself, and its two SUEs. This approach is consistent with the plan's stated aims with regard to sustainability, and I see no reason to question it. However, the same policy also allows for 1,210 dwellings out of the district's overall requirement to be in the rural area, which includes Irchester. This part of the strategy seems to me to recognise the need for some growth in the smaller settlements, to maintain their vitality and viability. The quota for the rural area has evidently not yet been fully taken up, and the Council seems to accept that the development now proposed would not lead to it being significantly exceeded. The development would therefore not conflict with the broad strategy of Policy 10 with regard to its location in the rural area.
56. I accept that the development would effectively use up all of the balance of the rural area figure. But over the plan period so far, development in the rural area has been spread between a number of locations, and there is no convincing evidence that Irchester's overall share would be excessive. The plan period still has some years to run, but given the district-wide shortfall of housing delivery to date, and the lack of any early prospect of any site allocations DPDs in the rural area, that is not a good reason for holding back permissions if acceptable proposals come forward. Certainly there is nothing in the policy itself that seeks to prevent such a situation.
57. Although Irchester is not designated as a 'small town', it is one of the district's larger villages, with a population of over 5,000. It has a good range of services, including a school, shops, doctor's surgery, library, and employment. In the draft SSP, it was identified in the first category of the proposed new settlement hierarchy, to be known as 'limited service role villages'. Although the SSP carries no weight as such, it is significant that the Council should see Irchester in that light. The location therefore accords with the requirement in CSS Policy 1 that development in the rural area should be focussed on villages that perform the role of a sustainable local service centre, and with the aim of Policy 9 that development should strengthen the settlement network.
58. Whilst the appeal site is outside the settlement boundary, it is adjacent to the built-up area, and reasonably close to the village centre. Its location in relation to village facilities is therefore not unsustainable. And in any event, Policy 1 allows for development outside but adjoining village boundaries, where there are exceptional circumstances and the development is for local needs. In the present case, it seems to me that the need to make good the district-wide housing shortfall constitutes such a circumstance.
59. I conclude that the proposed development would not conflict to any significant extent with the overall strategy of the CSS relating to the broad location and distribution of development, or any of the relevant policies which seek to promote sustainable patterns of development in the district.

Effects on the countryside and village setting

Policies relating to development in the countryside

60. In policy terms, the appeal sites are in the countryside, by virtue of being outside the village boundary.
61. In the LP, Policy G6 seeks to resist development of any kind in the countryside, unless various provisos are met. These include that the number of buildings should be small, and that the impact on the character of the countryside should be minimised. The written justification for the policy refers to the countryside's intrinsic vale and vulnerability, and it is clear from this that the policy's aim is to protect the countryside for its own sake. With regard to the present development, I shall go on to consider the question of its visual impact shortly, but in any event, the proposals for Site A would clearly involve considerably more than a small number of buildings. The appeal scheme thus exceeds the scale of development which the policy envisages as an allowable exception.
62. Similarly, LP Policy H4 presumes against new housing in the countryside, except for agricultural or replacement dwellings and conversions. The explanatory text refers to the countryside's high environmental quality. It is evident from this that the purpose of the policy is to protect the countryside against encroachment from built development.
63. In the adopted CSS, Policy 9 states that development in the countryside is to be strictly controlled, and Policy 10 that such development is to be restricted. Policy 13 sets out principles for sustainable development, which include conserving the character of the landscape.

Whether countryside policies are consistent with the NPPF

64. In the light of the NPPF, and particularly paragraph 49, consideration has to be given as to whether the above policies can still be regarded as up-to-date. The advice in paragraph 49 is particularly relevant here, in the light of the shortfall that has been established in the district's housing land supply. However, that paragraph states that it relates specifically to policies for the supply of housing, whereas the LP and CSS policies that I have identified in this section (or the relevant parts of those policies) are primarily for the protection of the countryside. I accept that such policies may also have an effect on housing supply, but that is not their main purpose. As such, it does not seem to me that these are policies of the kind that paragraph 49 says should be regarded as out-of-date.
65. Although paragraph 49 is evidently intended to ensure that the need for housing does not take second place to other policy considerations, that does not mean that those other considerations, including the protection of the countryside, should be disregarded altogether. The importance of recognising the countryside's intrinsic character and beauty is one of the Framework's core principles, as set out at paragraph 17, and paragraph 109 seeks to ensure that valued landscapes are protected and enhanced. The protection of the environment, in its widest sense, is one of the three 'dimensions' of sustainability, as set out in paragraph 7. The LP and CSS policies referred to above seem to me broadly consistent with these aims.
66. Whilst the appeal site does not lie within any designated area of special landscape value, that does not mean that it has no value. Nor does it mean

that it is not valued by local people. Nothing in the NPPF suggests that non-designated countryside may not be valued or protected.

67. It therefore seems to me that to me that the countryside protection policies that I have identified, and the development's effects on the countryside, should still be weighed in the balance against other relevant considerations.

The development's effects on the countryside

68. Appeal Site A lies adjacent to the north-eastern approach to Irchester, on Chester Road. Approaching the village from this direction, it is immediately apparent that here there has not been the large-scale estate development that has taken place elsewhere around its edges. Instead, something of the village's original linear form survives and older buildings extend all the way along the High Street, right to the edge of the built-up area. The land on either side forms part of the slopes of a shallow valley, and seen from this angle, the village sits within the contours so that the buildings and landscape together form a harmonious rural composition. Consequently, it seems to me that the approach along Chester Road is easily the most attractive point of entry to the village by road, and embraces some of the most pleasing views both into and out of it.
69. Site A also lies adjacent or close to the network of public footpaths that encircles the north-western side of the village, including the important link to Irchester Country Park. I saw on my visit that these paths appear to be well used, even in winter, and that observation is also supported by evidence given at the inquiry. The landscape in this area is one of very large fields with few hedges. From this direction, there are attractive, rustic views of the rear of the High Street, and unobstructed, long-distance views across the appeal site and Chester Road, to the open country beyond. These views are again amongst Irchester's most scenic attractions, and contribute significantly to the enjoyment of the countryside immediately around the village.
70. The appeal site is prominently located on the inside of a large, sweeping bend. Its boundaries are completely open, with no existing hedgerows or natural screening (except for part of the southern side, but that is the one part of the site that adjoins the existing village). The site rises up the slope to a height well above the existing buildings on Chester Road, and extends further back than the existing development in this part of the village. As a result of these factors, it seems to me that to me that development on the scale now proposed would be highly intrusive in views from the road and local footpaths. Such a development would dominate the village's setting, and would stand out as a conspicuous and incongruous incursion into the countryside.
71. In these respects, my view differs from that of the appellants' landscape witness. I appreciate that his opinion has been arrived at objectively, following recognised methodology for such assessments. However, it seems to me that whatever method is used, matters of this kind also involve a judgement which is at least partly subjective. In the light of all the evidence and representations before me, I am satisfied that the view that I have expressed above is not an isolated one, but is shared by at least some local residents.
72. I am aware that Irchester Parish Council has previously expressed the view that, if any land were to be allocated for development outside the village boundary, it should be at this site. However, that comment was not made in

the context of the present appeal, and was contingent on a maximum size of up to 60 dwellings. At the present inquiry, it was made clear that the Parish objects to the current appeal proposals.

Conclusion on countryside impact

73. I conclude that the proposed development on Site A would take a substantial area of undeveloped countryside. Due to its size and extent, it would cause substantial harm to the area's character and appearance and to the setting of Irchester village, contrary to the aims of the policies identified above, including LP Policies G6 and H4, and CSS Policy 13. This is a significant consideration to be weighed alongside others in the final balance.

Traffic and highway safety in Chester Road

74. Highway safety, satisfactory access and traffic impact are included amongst the sustainable development principles set out in CSS Policy 13. That policy is also supported by paragraph 32 of the Framework, which refers to the need for safe and suitable access for all people. I agree with the Council that safety is an important consideration in the appeal.

Traffic calming

75. Much of the appellants' case at the inquiry was based on the proposition that a package of traffic calming measures would be introduced in Chester Road, including an extension of the 30 mph speed limit area to beyond the site's main access, plus possibly a 'village gateway' feature and vehicle-activated warning signs. I agree that, in principle, some form of traffic calming for this section of Chester Road would be highly desirable. I also accept that there is a reasonable prospect that some types of calming measures could be effective here in reducing traffic speeds, although in my view this would depend on there being the combination of a speed limit change as well as other measures, in the final overall package. If a satisfactory calming scheme could be assured, then I accept that it would be right to make some allowance for its likely effects when assessing the development's junction visibility requirements.

76. However, there is no legal agreement or undertaking with regard to these matters. Consequently, the only way of securing any such works would be by way of a 'Grampian-type' planning condition. But such a condition could not be used to secure the change in the speed limit, because of the need for a Traffic Order, which cannot be guaranteed to be granted. Without that element, there is no certainty that any other calming measures would be as effective. And in any event, there seems to be no clear agreement with the Highway Authority as to precisely what form those other traffic calming measures should take, nor any commitment on the Authority's part to support them. I am therefore not convinced that a satisfactory traffic calming scheme could be secured by way of a condition.

77. In the circumstances, it seems to me that no reliance can be placed on the proposed traffic calming, and I have assessed the highways issues based on the existing traffic speeds and road conditions.

Relevant standards

78. The appellants' traffic survey, towards the northern end of the site frontage, shows speeds of around 39 mph in both directions. At this level, I acknowledge that a case could be made for applying either the *Manual for*

Streets (MFS) or the *Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)* standards. However, 39 mph is above the range of speeds for which MFS contains specific guidance on stopping distances. And as things stand, Chester Road functions as a movement route between settlements rather than as an urban street. In the circumstances of this particular site and development proposal, it seems to me that a cautious approach is justified. I therefore consider the more demanding DMRB standards more suited in this case.

Access and visibility

79. The proposals for Site A involve three new vehicular accesses to Chester Road. All three would be outside the area covered by the existing 30 mph speed limit. Dealing first with the most northerly of these, which is intended as the main access, it was accepted at the inquiry that the achievable visibility at this point is at least 120m to the north and 125m to the south. This is sufficient to meet the DMRB's recommended 'y-distance' for the existing speed. The 'x-distance' of 2.4 would be less than that normally advised by the DMRB, but it was agreed that this was not unacceptable here. The northern access would therefore be capable in my view of providing reasonably safe access to the site for vehicular traffic.
80. The same cannot be said for either of the other two proposed access points, since neither would meet the DMRB standards. The appellants' witness admitted that if the speed limit were not altered, it could not be said with any certainty that either of these secondary accesses would be safe. However, it seems to me that neither is essential to the scheme. One would serve only the proposed medical centre, and the other a possible pumping station. These are uses often found within a residential area, and there seems no reason why they could not both be served from the main residential access, if necessary. The additional loading on that access would be fairly modest, and there would be no change at all to the overall volume of traffic generated onto Chester Road.
81. I note the Council's reservations about this approach, but there is no plausible evidence to suggest that such a change would be likely to give rise to any significant traffic or amenity problems. Such issues could therefore safely be left to be resolved at the detailed stage. Although the safety audit was carried out on a different basis, that does not prevent a balanced judgement being made, based on the information available now.
82. Although access is not a reserved matter, that does not mean that the details now proposed cannot be varied by condition. Indeed, the Framework advises at paragraph 203 that authorities should always consider whether development can be made acceptable by imposing conditions, and where it is possible to do so, that is clearly preferable to an unnecessary refusal. In the present case, had there been no other overriding objections to the development, I consider that the highways issues relating to the medical centre and pumping station could have been overcome by a condition limiting all vehicular access to a single, specified point.

Other traffic matters relating to Site A

83. I note the concerns of local residents regarding the general effects of increased traffic within Irchester. However, the evidence suggests that this would be unlikely to exceed the capacity of village streets. Additional traffic is always

unwelcome, but here there is no evidence that in this case the level of traffic generated would be likely to cause unacceptable harm.

84. I agree that the slip road from Chester Road onto the A45 leaves much to be desired, but I note that neither the County Council nor the Highways Agency sees this as a cause for objection.

Conclusion on highways and safety issues relating to Site A

85. Despite the lack of any firm or deliverable traffic calming, and notwithstanding the shortcomings of two of the proposed access, the proposed main access would meet the relevant standards, and would have sufficient capacity to serve the whole development. Subject to the necessary condition discussed above, I conclude that the development would not adversely affect traffic safety in Chester Road. In this respect the proposed development on Site A would meet the relevant requirements of CSS Policy 13 with regard to traffic and access.

Traffic and highway safety in Alfred Street

86. Alfred Street has a narrow carriageway, agreed to be only 3.2m wide, with no passing places and no turning head. When vehicles need to pass, this can only be accommodated by mounting one or both footways, or by reversing to one end of the street, either into the Sports Club, or onto the main Wollaston Road. Although there is said to be no record of any recent accidents, it seems to me that to me that these manoeuvres must cause some danger for pedestrians and other road users, not to mention the potential for obstruction and inconvenience to residents.
87. I also saw on my visit that the kerbs and footways had suffered considerable damage, leaving them in an unsightly and potentially hazardous condition. Whatever other causes there may be, it seems to me that likely that the overrunning by vehicles has played a significant part in this. Whilst I do not suggest that this is due to the Sports Club alone, there can be little doubt that the Club is Alfred Street's largest traffic generator.
88. The present proposals for Site B would more than double the sports ground's existing size. From the information presented by Irchester Sports Association, it is clear that the additional land would enable the Association to substantially expand its facilities, with an additional full-size all-weather football pitch, a further full-size grass pitch, two junior-sized and three mini-football pitches. This would allow all of those teams that currently have to train and play their home matches elsewhere to be brought together on the Alfred Street site. Unless there were clear evidence to the contrary, it seems to me that such a major expansion of the Club's playing facilities would be likely to be accompanied by a significant increase in vehicular movements, with a consequent exacerbation of the problems identified above.
89. I appreciate that, even in the current situation, teams will usually assemble at the Alfred Street ground before travelling to play elsewhere, and then return to the site again later. This being so, I can see how a doubling of playing capacity might not necessarily lead to a doubling of vehicular movements. But equally the assertion that traffic would not increase at all is greatly oversimplified, as this does not take account of the potential for increased numbers of matches, or increased membership, or of traffic associated with spectators and other non-playing visitors. In the absence of any survey evidence or properly quantified forecasts, it seems most likely that the expansion of the

existing facilities would result in a net traffic increase, and indeed this was accepted by the appellants' traffic witness under questioning at the inquiry.

90. I accept that some of the additional journeys will be on foot or by bicycle. But the Club's own future plans are said to include increased car parking, and this seems to me to acknowledge that there will also be an increase in car journeys. I agree that timetabling, as in the ISA's proposed management plan, could help to avoid adding to the traffic at the peak times on Saturday afternoons. But in my view this would not deal with the main issue, which is about the overall vehicle numbers, rather than just the peak periods.
91. I fully agree that the proposed extension to the ISA sports ground would bring substantial social and recreational benefits to the village. But these must be weighed against the harm that would result from the extra traffic. It may be true that the harm could be mitigated by design; a 'shared surface' approach might cope better than the existing traditional street layout. But no such proposals are before me, and in the absence of any agreement with the Highway Authority, neither could such measures be properly secured by condition. Without some form of mitigation, it seems to me that to me that the harm that would be caused to highway safety, and the inconvenience to the residents of Alfred Street, would be disproportionate to the scheme's benefits.
92. I note the advice in paragraph 32 of the Framework, that development should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts are severe. In my view, for the reasons that I have identified, this is such a case. I therefore conclude that the proposals for Site B would not meet the aims of the relevant requirements of CSS Policy 13 relating to traffic and access.

Suitability of Site A for the proposed medical centre

93. Irchester's existing doctors' surgery is small and cramped, and I see no reason to question the desirability of relocating it to more suitable premises. The move to appeal Site A is supported by the doctors' practice. However, it is opposed by the Patients' Group.
94. Whilst the proposed medical centre site adjoins the built-up area, it is well away from the main existing residential areas. Walking distances from most parts of the village would be between 800m - 1500m. Such distances are far from ideal for a facility of this nature, which is likely to be visited most frequently by the elderly, and by mothers with young children. These groups are likely to include a significant number of non-drivers. None of the existing bus services passes near the proposed site, and there is no suggestion that the public transport contribution in the Section 106 agreement would be likely to change this.
95. Furthermore, the majority of journeys to the new medical centre on foot would have to negotiate the restricted footway outside No 111 High Street, where the pavement reduces to about 400mm. This is too narrow for wheelchairs, mobility scooters, prams or buggies, and would be likely to cause problems for a parent walking with young children, or for the partially sighted. I accept that ambulant patients could avoid the obstruction by crossing the street, but it seems likely that many would simply step into the carriageway. Although there is apparently no record of accidents at this point, that is in a context where at present there is little reason for many pedestrians to go beyond this point.

Locating a medical centre at the appeal site would be bound to increase the usage of this section of footway, and thus to increase the accident risk. No proposals are in place to improve safety. In my view the increased accident risk would be unacceptable.

96. Whatever special arrangements might be made to assist those with particular difficulties, this would not change the fact that many patients would face a long and potentially dangerous walk to the new site.
97. For these reasons, I conclude that in the absence of any proposals to improve either transport or safety, Site A would not be a satisfactory or acceptable site for the proposed new medical centre.

OTHER MATTERS

Benefits of the proposed scheme

Housing

98. The beneficial effect of the scheme in increasing the local housing supply has been discussed above. In addition, around 37 of the proposed dwellings would be affordable housing, which would help to meet local needs. I have given substantial weight to these benefits.

General economic and social benefits

99. The development would provide a substantial stimulus to the local economy during the construction period, and would contribute to encouraging an economic recovery at national level. It would also have some longer-lasting benefits, in that it would help to counter the village's declining and ageing population profile, and would help to underpin the viability of local shops, businesses and services. In addition, some of the Section 106 contributions would be likely to have wider benefits for the village as a whole, particularly the footpath contribution, which would be used to improve the link from the village to the Country Park. The Council would also receive a substantial sum from the government's New Homes Bonus. All of these matters carry some weight. However, none is unique to this particular development.

The sports ground

100. For the reasons discussed above, although the proposed extension to the ISA sports ground would have benefits for the village, those benefits are outweighed in my view by the lack of mitigation for the effects on safety and local residents in Alfred Street.
101. In addition, there is the complication of the relatively short term remaining on the existing lease, which is due to expire in 2026. If that lease were unable to be renewed, the extension land would be left without access. The ISA is confident that the renewal will be straightforward when the time comes. However, until the position has been formally resolved, it seems to me that there will continue to be some uncertainty, and until then it remains to be seen whether the Football Association's funding offer will be able to proceed to the formal contracts stage.
102. This uncertainty as to deliverability reinforces my view that the benefits of the proposed sports ground extension are not so great as to outweigh the harm that this part of the appeal scheme would cause in its present form.

The medical centre

103. Similar considerations apply to the proposed medical centre. For the reasons already explained, the new centre's benefits to the local community are tempered by the lack of easy access for patients travelling other than by car.
104. In addition, there is significant uncertainty about the funding of the new facility, given the lack of any clear commitment from either the former PCT or its successor body. I do not doubt the doctors' desire to bring the project to fruition, but it appears that this is not entirely in their own hands. Nothing in the Section 106 agreement, or in the option agreement with the doctors' practice, guarantees that if planning permission were granted for the proposed housing, the new medical centre would necessarily follow. Accordingly, the weight that I can give to any benefits of this element of the scheme is significantly reduced.

Council's submissions regarding procedural unfairness

105. During the inquiry, the Council advanced legal submissions, at some length, to the effect that the grant of permission for the appeal proposals would be unlawful. This proposition is founded on the contention that the appellants failed to make clear, during the application and pre-application stages, the fact that granting permission for the proposed housing would not necessarily ensure the delivery of the proposed medical centre too. In the Council's submission, the lack of clarity on this point was misleading to the public, and consequently any decision to grant permission would result in unfairness. In addition, it is argued that the Council itself was misled into publicising the application inaccurately, thus giving rise to a breach of the relevant regulations. As a result, the Council submits that *"the Inspector has no power to determine this appeal other than to reject it"*.
106. I have considered these arguments very carefully. There is no doubt that any deliberate misrepresentation or attempt to mislead the Council or the public would be a serious matter. However, in the present case the Council acknowledges that there is no question of any improper conduct. I accept that it is possible that some members of the public might have formed incorrect assumptions regarding the delivery of the medical centre. But that does not mean that they were misled.
107. The Council points to the description of the development, as presented in the application form, which formed the basis for the Council's own consultation letters. It is true that the description did not say that the delivery of the medical centre was not guaranteed. But it would not normally be expected that such matters would be dealt with in the application form. In my view, the description in this case was a correct and adequate statement of what was being applied for. The Council's consultations based on the same wording were therefore in order.
108. The Council also points to statements made by the appellants in various other documents. But the material prepared for the appellants' public exhibition in February 2012 made it clear that at that stage a doctors surgery was being considered only as a possibility. Similarly, the Planning Statement submitted in March 2012 referred only to the provision of *"land for a new medical centre"*. Although there may have been some inconsistency in the

terms used in different documents, it does not seem to me that either of these documents misrepresented the position. A reasonably well informed member of the public reading them would have been aware that there was a difference between making land available for the medical centre and guaranteeing its delivery.

109. I appreciate that the terms of the option agreement with the local doctors' practice (Irchester Surgery) were only produced at the inquiry. And I accept that that this was the first time that the Council or members of the public were likely to have been aware of this agreement or its contents. The document makes it clear that there is no obligation on either party to proceed with the medical centre. But that is no different from the position had no such agreement existed. The delivery of the medical centre could only have been guaranteed by the appellants entering into a planning obligation to that effect. As far as I can tell, no such planning obligation has ever been offered or sought. I can see no good reason why the Council or anyone else should have been under any misapprehension in that respect.
110. In any event, the number of representations and signatures from persons opposing the proposed development is exceptionally large in relation to the size of the village. Even if the Council were right in suspecting that others might have been misled into not objecting, it seems to me unlikely that their numbers could have been significant. And in any event, whilst I have had regard to all of the representations made, my decision must turn on the force of the arguments rather than the weight of numbers alone. I am satisfied therefore, that the outcome of the appeal has not been prejudiced by any misunderstanding of the proposals by potential objectors.
111. For all these reasons, I reject the Council's submissions on these matters. There is no evidence that anyone was, or reasonably could have been, misled about any aspect of the proposed development, and as far as I can tell, there seems to have been no breach of any relevant regulations. I conclude that allowing the appeal and granting planning permission for the development would not cause unfairness on these grounds, and therefore would not be unlawful. However, this does not affect my judgement as to the scheme's planning merits.

Additional matters raised by local residents

112. During the inquiry, and in written submissions, a range of other objections were raised by members of the public. These included the effects on the capacity of local schools and other village facilities, the effects on the local drainage and sewerage infrastructure, the effects on archaeology, the effects on flora and fauna (including the rare Venus Looking-Glass flower which has apparently been discovered near to Site B), and concerns regarding the safety of the possible new drainage pond.
113. I do not dismiss any of these concerns lightly. However, from the information available, and in the light of the responses from the various statutory consultees with responsibility for some of these matters, it seems to me that none of these amounts to a compelling or overriding objection to the present proposal. Given the nature of my conclusions on the main issues set out above, it is not necessary for me to deal in more detail with these matters here.

CONCLUSIONS

114. On the one hand, the proposed development would boost housing supply in a district lacking a 5-year supply, and it would also contribute to the local and national economy. On the other, the proposals for Site A would cause harm to the character and appearance of the countryside and the setting of the older part of the village, and those for Site B would cause danger to highway safety and inconvenience to local residents in Alfred Street. For the reasons given elsewhere in this decision, none of the other considerations is decisive.
115. I give considerable weight to the scheme's housing and economic benefits. However, the harm that I have identified is substantial too, and gives rise to significant conflicts with development plan policies and with relevant guidance in the Framework.
116. The harm to the countryside at Site A would be irreversible, and with a development on the scale now proposed, could not be adequately mitigated. I appreciate that refusing permission for the present scheme may mean that other sites have to be found, and these too may be in the countryside. However, I must base my decision on the merits of the scheme that is before me, and I conclude that the harm that would result from the development now proposed on Site A would clearly outweigh the benefits.
117. In the case of Site B, the economic benefits of the proposed development on that site would be much less, and for the reasons that I have explained, the social and recreational benefits are uncertain. Whilst the impacts on Alfred Street could possibly be mitigated, no such mitigation could be secured through the present appeal. In the circumstances, the harm again clearly outweighs the benefits.
118. I have taken into account the Framework's presumption regarding sustainable development. But development which conflicts with Framework policies, taken as a whole, is by definition unsustainable. I agree that the development plan is silent on the question of how the housing supply is to be made up. But protecting the countryside and highway safety remain important policy aims, and even where relevant housing policies are out of date, it is still necessary to strike a balance with other considerations such as these.
119. Having taken account of all the other matters raised, I find nothing that causes me to depart from these conclusions. I therefore conclude, on balance, that planning permission should be refused. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

John Felgate

INSPECTOR

ABBREVIATIONS

CSS	Core Spatial Strategy
DMRB	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges
DPDs	Development Plan Documents
ISA	Irchester Sports Association
MFS	Manual For Streets
NCC	Northamptonshire County Council
NNJPU	North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
RR	Refusal Reason
SUE	Sustainable Urban Extension
WLP	Wellingborough Local Plan

Richborough Estates

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr Anthony Crean QC	(Instructed by the Borough Solicitor)
He/She called:	
Mr Nigel Ozier, BA(Hons) MRTPI	Brian Barber Associates
Mr Ian Brazier, BEng(Hons) CEng MICE	Abington Consulting Engineers

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Jeremy Cahill QC	(Instructed by Bird, Wilford & Sale, solicitors)
He/She called:	
Mr Michael Parkinson, BSc(Hons) CEng MICE MIHT MIRSO	Peter Brett Associates
Mr Dai Lewis, BSc(Hons) PGDip LA CMLI	The Environmental Dimension Partnership
Mr Tim Coleby, BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI	Peter Brett Associates

OTHER INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mr Peter Bone FCA MP	MP for Wellingborough & Rushden constituency
Cllr Mrs Pam Armstrong	Irchester Parish Council
Cllr Mrs Susan Homer	Northamptonshire County Council
Mr Chris Stenning	Save Irchester Village
Mr Tony Skipper	Save Irchester Village
Mr Tom Lloyd	Save Irchester Village
Mrs Jan Arnold	Save Irchester Village
Mrs Sally Underwood	Save Irchester Village
Mr Terry Perkins	Save Irchester Village
Mrs Geraldine Hunt	Save Irchester Village
Mr Richard Hunt	Save Irchester Village
Mr Richard Webb	Save Irchester Village
Mr Simon Davies	Save Irchester Village
Mr David Tubbs	Irchester Surgery
Cllr John Carr	Ward member for Irchester, Wellingborough Borough Council
Mr John Maguire	Irchester Sports Association

DOCUMENTS

DOCUMENTS TABLED JOINTLY (BY THE COUNCIL & APPELLANTS)

- GEN-1 Statement of Common Ground, dated 13 November 2012
- GEN-2 Additional Statement of Common Ground on Landscape and Visual Impact
- GEN-3 Revised list of suggested conditions, tabled on 8 March 2013
- GEN-4 Executed S.106 Agreement, dated 8 March 2013
- GEN-5 Agreed suggested itinerary for Inspector's site visit
- GEN-6 Plan showing agreed walking distances to local facilities

DOCUMENTS TABLED BY THE COUNCIL

- COU-1 Opening submissions by Mr Crean
- COU-2 Appeal decision – Ash Lane, Garforth (APP/N4720/A/10/2138574)
- COU-3 Appeal decision – Milton Road, Adderbury (APP/C3105/A/12/2168102)
- COU-4 'Sewers for Adoption – a Design and Construction Guide for Developers', August 2012 (extract)
- COU-5 Letter from Bird, Wilford & Sale, dated 12 February 2013
- COU-6 Northants County Council Capital Strategy, 2013-14 to 2017-18
- COU-7 NCC Cabinet Decision Statement – meeting held 4 September 2012
- COU-8 NCC Cabinet meeting 4 September 2012 – agenda item re infrastructure funding
- COU-9 Mr Crean's closing submissions Part 1, dated 24 February 2013
- COU-10 Mr Crean's final closing submissions, dated 12 March 2013

DOCUMENTS TABLED BY THE APPELLANTS

- APP-1 Appellants' covering email for additional documents submitted 5 February 2013
- APP-2 North Northants Annual Monitoring report 2011-12, published January 2013
- APP-3 Schedule of housing sites in Wellingborough – from AMR January 2013
- APP-4 North Northants Joint Committee 31 January 2013 – agenda item re Joint Core Strategy
- APP-5 North Northants Joint Committee 31 January 2013 – agenda item re Review of Housing Requirements
- APP-6 Appeal decision – Northampton Lane, Moulton (APP/Y2810/A/12/2178421)
- APP-7 Appeal decision and Inspector's report – Shottery, Stratford-upon-Avon (APP/J3720/A/11/2163206)
- APP-8 Addendum to table of affordable housing completions (p. 45 of Mr Coleby's proof)
- APP-9 Option agreement relating to land for proposed medical centre
- APP-10 Option agreement relating to land for proposed sports pitches
- APP-11 Judgement in the case of R v Save Our Parkland Appeal Ltd and East Devon DC and Axminster Carpets Ltd
- APP-12 'Manual for Streets 2', Sept 2010
- APP-13 'Traffic Calming' – Local Transport Note 1/07, DfT (March 2007)
- APP-14 North Northants Accessibility Strategy, March 2006

- APP-15 Opening statement by Mr Cahill
- APP-16 Large scale plan of Irchester, showing village facilities
- APP-17 Email from Bird, Wilford & Sale to Irchester Parish Council, dated 22 January 2013, re Sports Ground
- APP-18 Letter from Bird, Wilford & Sale to Irchester Parish Council, dated 15 October 2012, re Sports Ground
- APP-19 Judgement in the case of Tewkesbury BC v SoS and Comparo Ltd and Welbeck Strategic Land
- APP-20 North Northants Joint Committee 14 March 2013 – agenda item re Joint Core Strategy and Interim Housing Policy Statement
- APP-21 North Northants Joint Committee 14 March 2013 – agenda item re adopted Core Strategy compatibility with NPPF
- APP-22 North Northants Joint Committee 31 January 2013 – minutes
- APP-23 'Local Plans and the NPPF – compatibility self-assessment checklist' (LGA/PAS)
- [APP-24] [- not used -]
- APP-25 Mr Cahill's closing submissions Part 1, dated 6 March 2013
- APP-26 Mr Cahill's closing submissions Part 2, dated 17 March 2013

DOCUMENTS TABLED BY OTHER INTERESTED PERSONS

- IP-1 Opening statement on behalf of Save Irchester Village
- IP-2 Statement by Cllr Mrs Homer; with correspondence, petition and photos re traffic in Alfred Street
- IP-3 Statement by Mr Stenning
- IP-4 Statement by Mr Skipper; with attachments relating to Save Irchester Countryside Campaign, abolition of regional strategies, Irchester Parish Plan, Irchester Surgery, Alfred Street, and Wollaston School cycle route
- IP-5 Statement by Mr Lloyd
- IP-6 Statement by Mrs Arnold; with attachments relating to landscape changes, population growth, archaeology, historic buildings, and photographs
- IP-7 Statement by Mrs Underwood; with attachments relating to ecology and the Nene Valley SPA
- IP-8 Information from Mrs Underwood re the Venus Looking-Glass Flower
- IP-9 Statement by Mr Perkins
- IP-10 Statement by Mrs Hunt
- IP-11 Statement by Mr Hunt; with attachments relating to drainage, sewage and flooding
- IP-12 Statement by Mr Webb; with attachments relating to issues with the proposed balancing pond
- IP-13 Statement by Mr Davies; with photographs
- IP-14 Correspondence regarding the new surgery, submitted by Mr Skipper
- IP-15 Irchester Surgery Business Case, tabled by Mr Tubbs
- IP-16 Statement by Cllr Carr
- IP-17 Irchester 'Village Voice' magazine, submitted by Cllr Carr
- IP-18 Notes of Committee site viewing, submitted by Cllr Carr
- IP-19 Irchester Rural Housing Survey, January 2013 - submitted by Cllr Carr
- IP-20 Email from NCC re highway boundary, Feb 2013 - submitted by Cllr Carr
- IP-21 Irchester Surgery Patient Participation Report - submitted by Cllr Carr
- IP-22 Bundle of documents tabled by Cllr Carr, including items from Committee papers, consultation responses, and Barwood website

- IP-23 Statement by Mr Maguire on behalf of Irchester Sports Association; with letter from the Football Association
- IP-24 Email from Mr Maguire dated 26 February 2013, with copies of sports ground lease and declaration by John Henry Mann
- IP-25 Email from Mr Maguire dated 26 February 2013, with information relating to overhead electricity cables
- IP-26 Email from Mr Skipper dated 27 February 2013, with correspondence relating to Irchester to Wollaston cycleway scheme
- IP-28 Letter from DR Solicitors dated 5 March 2013, re Irchester Surgery – submitted by Mr Tubbs
- IP-29 Note from Mr Webb re access to pumping station

Richborough Estates