

Michael Burton
Principal Planning Policy Officer

Cedar Drive
THRAPSTON
Northamptonshire
NN14 4LZ

Telephone 01832 742010

Email: planningpolicy@east-northamptonshire.gov.uk

25th February 2018

Re: Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan for Glapthorn (Glapthorn Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2031), submitted 14 December 2017: Legal Check under Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Please find attached an objection to the above draft plan.

Yours Sincerely

Gez Willard

Chartered Town and Country Planner.

M.R.T.P.I

Copy to client

Draft GLAPTHORN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2016 – 2031

Objection dated 25th February 2018

This objection is submitted on behalf of Mr Brown who is the owner of the White Cottage, Main Street.

The main objection that they have to the draft plan is the tightly drawn revised settlement boundary. It is considered that the settlement boundary ought properly to be drawn around all existing houses and gardens in addition to any deemed suitable development sites. Whilst this is indeed generally the case as the village proposal map shows this is glaringly not the approach taken in respect of properties lying to the central southern part of the site. It is an unnecessary and unwelcome inconsistency.

It is a long held tenet of the land use planning process that boundaries in land use plans ought to be drawn along well established and clearly defined features such as tree/hedge lines, ditches or watercourses.

The draft settlement boundary in this case (central-southern area) instead draws an imaginary and wholly arbitrary line about half way along the gardens of houses. Whilst the authors of the plan may think this is certain way of preventing backland housing development during the plan period it in inappropriate way to do so and an inappropriate aim too.

As the *google earth* (attached) image shows much of the land within the proposed extended settlement boundary proposed by My Brown (also attached) constitutes garden land which already has garden structures sited within and in one case a tennis court. The erection of garden structures and outbuildings within these long gardens can still take place under householders permitted development rights and this is as it should be. These exceptionally long gardens are every much a feature of Glapthorn as the largely linear nature of the village. They cannot and should not be artificially changed on a plan merely to emphasise, in administrative terms, linear form.

The intent that the plan seeks is to limit backland development and emphasise linear form. The draft plan as written does indeed do this but at present at the expense of sound and well established planning principles about where to draw village boundaries which are robust and capable of long term protection and understanding. It is the latter points that are critical. The alignment of the village settlement boundary ought to be robust and capable of long term defence, understanding and protection.

The present (draft) village settlement boundary is not so drawn and it is objected to as it stands. The boundary should instead be redrawn so as to reflect facts on the ground and along the line as indicated in the hatched line (attached) as part of this submission.

In addition to the above the plan contains a clear aversion to backland development. Whilst it is true that when poorly designed development and sites come forward which have scant regard to scale or setting such development can be aesthetically damaging. However such a strict limit (on back land housing) risks an anodyne and bland plan that does not allow for thoughtful, well prepared proposals which seek through good design to create spaces and places of visual interest and relief. Without compromising the linear nature of the village there may come forward during the life of the plan opportunities for such thoughtful development to the rear of existing houses. Engineered and hard cul-de-sacs and the like would clearly not be appropriate to Glapthorn but individual, bespoke and well mannered single housing plots to the rear of houses would not be either damaging nor would they inherently harm or change the linear character of the village. Exemplars of such intimate, interesting and very localised forms of development to the rear can be found all across the much loved and protected Cotswolds AONB. There can be few who having seen such glimpses along side passages next to mellow stone cottages and reached along narrow driveways have not at an instant been charmed and intrigued by them. The plan should be changed by omitting a blanket opposition to back land development so as to allow such charming cameos to be created in this mainly linear village.

There is an additional further benefit of such an approach. Given the closer relationship between new housing at the rear to its host or sponsor house such schemes are often tackled and taken on by family members and the properties retained jointly within the family. Without invoking legal challenge over local occupancy conditions well designed developments to the rear of existing can as a matter of practice aid the delivery of local housing for local people.

Conclusion

The respondent objections to the following aspects of the draft plan.

Policy 2- Settlement boundary

The policies proposal map (3) ought to be amended in the central southern section to that as set out in this submission.

Policy 4 (3) is to strictly worded and ought to be changed as follows:

1. *It is well related to the existing built form of the village is not overly engineered (eg... cul-de-sacs) and not encroaching beyond the village (note: as revised) settlement boundary;*

This brevity will allow applications to be judged on their merits and decision makers to support well designed and intimate developments.

Policy 10- Design Principles

The following should be deleted:

'Development proposals which do not respect the linearity character of the village, such as use of rear gardens for placement of dwellings, will not be supported.'

and replaced with the following:

'Any development that is proposed to the rear of existing houses shall be limited to no more than 1 dwelling per plot and in addition to providing for safe access and adequate car parking such development will only be allowed where it is shown that development is well related to existing development, respectful in form and design and which demonstrably enriches villagescape by adding visual interest.'