

Raunds Area Plan

Raunds/Stanwick Workshop Event Saxon Hall 26th February 2007

Group 1 - Stanwick Village Group

Q1

- There was some concern that the boundary drawn is that which was requested by the Parish Council
- Why is Orchard Farm and Hall Farm not included?
- Some members of the group say they feel the boundary does represent what the Parish Council requested
- The boundary will restrict development outside Raunds
- The group is happy with the boundary as drawn

Q2

- How is affordable housing defined, is it social housing?
- Have heard bad reports of shared ownership in that it means people pay more than if they had a mortgage
- There are quite a few affordable houses in the village
- What does 'local' mean in terms of local people?
- By the time the houses are built they will not stick to the requirement
- One person wants their family to be able to move into the village
- 32% increase in the size of the village, are they all large dwellings?
- Will an affordable housing estate be built in the village?
- This is not a big issue as there are not many sites where you could get 5 or more houses
- No village infrastructure for lots of housing
- We need affordable housing but do not want social housing
- We need smaller houses
- Quite condensed village so could social housing create quite a big village

- ENC should make the decision about who should move and not Spire Homes, ENC should be aware of who is moving into the village
- Parish Plan questionnaire says that no affordable housing.
- Concern about having affordable housing in a block which is not integrated
- Want to see true integration and not plonked in less desirable part of site

Q3

- Replace if it needs replacing but no additional housing
- Maybe barn conversions are ok
- Important that dwellings preserve the character of the village
- Group discussed new large dwellings that are out of character with the village
- Strong feeling about appropriate design of houses
- Mish mash of different styles, lots of badly designed houses have been allowed in the past
- Stanwick means stone buildings
- ENC planning department need to listen to the Parish Council. There is no consistency in the planning department
- When the Parish Council do not want development because it does not fit in it gets approved. The view of the Parish Council is not considered sufficiently enough
- Could Stanwick House which was burnt down be redeveloped and designed as Stanwick House? Since the fire the site has been used as a factory.

Q4

- The very small green area to east is the pub car park
- The pocket park area looks very big are there any guidelines on size?
- There are four football teams in the village and no room at present to train and support sports facilities
- The group is happy with the extension of the sports field
- Could the pocket park be used for a children's play area?
- There has been previous discussions with developers who own the land identified for the pocket park
- Football is very important in the village because it helps children with social skills and this should be expanded

Q5

- Traffic calming on Church Street is needed, this is a dangerous road
- Village questionnaire brought up issues of the need for traffic calming
- There is as much traffic now as before and there is now the by-pass
- Expansion of school playing field needed
- Need a space (indoors) for young people. Nowhere for young people to go where they can run around and feel ownership of the space. An area could be incorporated into the football pitch expansion
- A bridge over to Stanwick Lakes is needed

Q6

- Agree with the vision but heard it all before

Main Points

1. No further expansion
2. Concern about what social housing means
3. There is a need for more recreational facilities

Group 2 Stanwick Village Group

Q1

- Boundary – paddock 3/4 include this in the boundary
- Refer to the previous Parish Plan
- Include affordable housing
- Like to see some housing
- Query the siting of affordable housing adjacent to boundary

Q2

- Affordable housing needs to be in keeping with the character of the village, no flats
- Affordable housing should be for people in the village
- More needed for local people
- Possibly finish off the existing roads e.g. Needham Road, Dolben Avenue is well used to the north or better maintained/landscape design to make it safer
- The whole thing needs to be thought through
- Top of Dolben Avenue should be kept/maintained, should remain as it is
- We would like to keep the employment

- Infill is better than expanding as long as the character is maintained
- We have had enough development in the past e.g. Mallows
- Drainage, infrastructure is poor especially the water pressure, we could not cope with more housing
- Small development can fit in but not all development should match exactly

Q4

- Mix of recreation the existing is too well used. Football important
- A high percentage of the village uses the recreational facilities
- Pocket Park – keep some leisure area that is natural
- Good to keep off the bikes
- All of the site agree with
- Include cricket pitch somewhere – near the built up area
- Scrambling bikes or at least a proper area where everyone knows where they are. Make available at controlled times
- It is possible to take children to a proper location
- Better to work with than against
- Compromise and manage the situation
- There is a need for disclaimers
- Area – Lawrence Park/skate board
- Facilities – we need to be able to get to Stanwick Lakes
- Could Cotton Lane be improved and the other track be improved as well
- The County Council maintain throughout the year
- Cycle track as well but it can add some maintenance
- Link in with other facilities
- Green infrastructure
- Good balance of facilities but need more linkage
- Enhance what is there
- End of Cumberland Avenue affordable housing and other environmental improvements with green infrastructure. Improve the whole area
- Affordable housing needs to be a balanced approach that meets the need of local people
- The employment site - green bungalows for local people
- The group as a whole would like to see the employment retained

- Could be used for starter units
- We would like to see the strategic gap between Stanwick and Raunds as an area that will not be developed
- Some allotments, but we need to know the basis
- Maybe they should be developed on a formal basis
- Perhaps some to the north of the village

Main Points

1. Access to Stanwick Lakes is a priority and could be incorporated into a wider green network of footpaths and cycleways
2. We like the village as it is, there are some small opportunities on the proposed edge that could incorporate market and affordable housing
3. Any development should be in character with the village
4. Strategic gap between Raunds and Stanwick is good but this needs to be well defined and cover the whole area between the settlement

Group 3

Q1

- Generally in agreement that the boundary reflects the built up area.
- Do not agree with the inclusion of sites 1 and 2 (and 3 and 4)
- Town centre should include Saxon Hall and the town hall

Q2

- Too much 40% is too high for affordable housing
- Not clear who the housing is for
- A clearer definition of affordable housing is needed
- Affordable housing should be integrated within market housing

Q3

- Site 1 – flooding issues – floods even without housing
- Infrastructure issues particularly traffic and roads are a major issue
- School traffic – if the infants school and Manor School are all on the one site there will be implications on traffic
- All sites – the existing infrastructure is inadequate

- Gypsy issues – not happy about encouraging them to the area

Q4

- Why expand Manor School when the infants school and junior school are currently running under capacity?
- Still infrastructure issues
- If expanding Manor School there is a need to expand the infant and junior schools too
- Leisure facilities – swimming pool
- Anything that improves community/leisure facilities has to be good for the town
- Maybe put leisure facilities on a totally different site – somewhere in Raunds
- Leisure facilities on the football club land

Q5

- Agree with all regeneration site
- Support site 3 for parking although concern about access
- Car parking issues throughout the whole of Raunds
- Policing – Raunds needs a station and officers
- Need better shops, something to attract people to the town centre
- The road network in the town centre really needs addressing, increase the population and the problem will grow
- Shops encouragement – retail rates etc. we need new businesses
- Public transport – there isn't any!! We need services including doctors

Main Points

1. infrastructure – schools, roads, sewage etc. roads are the main issues alongside flooding
2. Town centre regeneration how can the town benefit? We would like to see improvements prior to the housing development
3. Not happy with sites 1 and 2 for development, would like to see development spread across more than one site

Group 4

Q1

- The town hall should be in the town centre boundary as well as the library
- The boundary should go up as far as Gells Garage
- The Saxon Hall should be included because this is the main meeting place
- A hidden agenda?
- Extend the town centre to the north and south to include shops and garage
- Include the churches
- Will they make it bigger or smaller?
- People from other villages come into Raunds. Worried that will broaden the town too much.
- Included planning area – do not agree with this new boundary
- Existing settlement boundary as it is now is ok
- The town hall is a significant omission from the town centre
- We do not agree with the new plan area boundary as it relates to the new development

Q2

- The governments percentage for affordable housing is 20% - we do not agree with the 40% this should be lower
- Why put in 5 houses in the centre of Raunds, planning permission being granted to housing development in the town centre – why was it not affordable housing?
- Why not put in the centre of Raunds and not on the outskirts
- We do not have the infrastructure in Raunds to support it
- It does not regenerate the town, social housing
- Jobs limited in the town centre
- Not a good bus service
- Suggesting 420 houses in this development site, Marshals Road has attracted homeless people which has social housing – drug problems in the area
- Cannot cope with social problems already, how will they cope with the new development
- Police a problem – the lack of them
- Houses in prime area of Raunds will change it. Other Greenfield site areas that would not affect the existing housing are suitable
- Will drive the children out of Raunds. Would they come back to Raunds?

- There is nothing in Raunds for young people, drug culture, no work push people away
- Do not feel safe on the streets
- More affordable housing will make it worse
- Mixed housing communities
- Key workers are suitable for housing
- Affordable housing for elderly also needed if want to down size not able to do so
- Raunds is a rural area, does not have the industry to support people. People who live in Raunds commute elsewhere for jobs
- Regeneration and have industry then have new housing
- Doctor's in Raunds do not have the right facilities
- Affordable housing – this should not be included
- We want affordable housing for part ownership and key workers – linked to economic activity
- We would be happy with affordable housing for key workers not 40%

Q3

- London Road site maybe a possible site
- If someone does not want to sell land then could they be forced to do so?
- Flood area – flooded three to four times this year already, this is a problem
- Insurance companies will not insure houses in a flood zone
- Documents present about flooding Midland Road – the council say they will pay for maintenance of floods but will they?
- There will be a drop in housing prices if affordable housing next to the one for sale
- No good road access
- Town not big enough to cope with new houses roads are terrible
- Look at the properties between Raunds and Stanwick and a lot are for sale due to the flooding issues
- Building on green space there are wildlife concerns
- A lot of horses live in this area where would they go?
- Reservoir near area 2, the fields flood here as well
- Site 2 is suitable, open arable, on high ground, access road could get traffic away from the town

- Concern that the proposed new road on the housing site will not be used and that people will cut through the town centre to get to the school
- More housing in London Road, on the rest of Raunds
- Light pollution as a consequence of the new housing development
- The schools are not big enough
- Playing fields (mixed use) can be used for development on west side as it is being moved away
- Sites 1 and 2 are the only green area for residents in the east
- Road access from sites three too small for lorries and a big distance from the main community. Should be more central
- The main entrance to Manor School is not big enough and when full they park on the roads near by causing congestion
- Will they be opening up the cul-de-sac? Access areas not wide enough
- How about at the north of Brick Kiln Road. There is not flooding and there are derelict buildings here
- Expand the football club, more facilities here. Have some activities at site 3 and some at the football ground
- Area 1 – red sticker – other possible sites, flood risk area
- Area 2 – amber sticker – strong access concerns

Q4

- Manor School – where will they accommodate new children?
- Are they assuming that all new people in the area will be over 11 years old?
- If Manor School is expanded we want accommodation for younger children
- Doctors needs to be expanded
- Agree school should be expanded but will lose identity as a town school. Loss of character
- Academic site of school – there are not enough resources for the current students
- Playing field is cramped already
- Ringstead, Stanwick, Higham Ferrers pupils will attend so needs to be expanded for them too.
- The feeder schools need to be expanded, access issues, loss of identity for Manor School

Q5

- Regeneration not suitable for population that will come with new housing. Inadequate with proposed scale of development
- We want a police station rather than a car park
- No one wants to park in the car parks because there are security issues
- Built new toilets – people are concerned about knocking down the new toilets
- The document does not say how regeneration will be achieved
- How do you access site 3
- The scale is inadequate, not in the right place
- Site 1 is a bad idea, a recipe for burglary

Main Points

1. Housing/flooding needs reconsidering
2. Lack of green space in the heart of Raunds
3. Affordable housing concerns

Group 5

Q1

- Tannery area? Over developed
- The south of Raunds is closer to the centre than the proposed development
- Roads to the new area all go through the town
- Existing roads are inadequate
- We need to get this right before the development
- Everyone needs a car to get to work there are no jobs in the town
- Someone will get killed on these roads
- Tanneries would be a better option
- Car park will be behind the shops and will encourage drug use
- Site for development will encourage people out of the town
- Putting all this housing into Raunds will cause more traffic problems
- No infrastructure in place
- Why can't the development be broken up into smaller areas?
- Town centre area – there is no where to park so retail development will not happen
- Parking is a real problem

- Someone will get killed in the town centre
- Houses are being built on land that should have been parking

Q2

- Split up the affordable housing and mix in with private housing
- Young people need affordable housing
- Concern about drug users etc
- Careful about the type of people who move in
- We do not want ghettos
- Original council houses now in private ownership
- Of the 40% affordable housing there should be 50% rented and 50% shared equity

Q3

- Access to the town centre is very difficult
- Concern about the scale of the development
- 2000/3000 cars in the new development
- No thought about safety
- Houses to be built on a junction near a school
- Why not have a one way system?
- The High Street is a race track
- Lawless in the town centre
- Selected land is low quality
- Used for dog walking on the land
- No benefit to the people of Raunds
- Improve Raunds as it is first then the development
- No jobs – dormitory town
- Split up to spread the problems
- Town will be top heavy
- Some would rather have Chelveston Road to even up the town
- Access to North Street will be a nightmare
- Need roads, doctors etc first
- Less facilities now than 25 years ago
- All shoe factories have gone
- No shops
- Elderly who do not have a car find shopping difficult
- Access to the A605 could be by London Road from Chelveston Road area

- Development north would give better access to the A45
- West area could be used – towards Stanwick
- Area 3 is proposed for community use would be up hill
- Want predominantly community use
- Will buses be re routed into the new area
- Poor access into area 3
- Outer ring road would be only access to area 3
- Swimming pool would be popular
- Would improve Manor School sports facilities
- Need plenty of car parking
- Serious problem with water supply and electricity
- Will the sewers cope?

Q4

- Manor School is at capacity
- With the new housing the school will need more capacity
- Expanding the site will cause more rat run problems
- Existing field at school is fenced off and not accessible to the public
- Tennis courts should be open to the public and new swimming pool
- Access to the school is difficult already. This will be worse if the school is expanding
- Peak time traffic is very bad
- Extend area 3 into Manor Farm (derelict)

Q5

- Land off High Street (Spinney) could be used for parking – not much support in green area
- Site 1 – access is difficult with no parking
- Lloyds pharmacy area is very bad for traffic
- Delivery lorries means you cannot see
- Site 2 and 3 – need to have car parking and extra parking
- Co-op parking area would need CCTV for security

Q6

- Self sufficiency there is concern that this will not happen
- People will commute out of the town
- Where will the jobs come from?
- Public transport needed

Main Points

1. Pressure on traffic in the town especially how the existing town accommodates the growth when there are already problems
2. Concern about development in one area rather than split up around the town to north and south so not too much pressure in one area – spread the risk
3. Lack of medical, unity and infrastructure, parking and whether this will be delivered with growth
4. Scale of the development and concern whether the town is capable of accommodating this.

Group 6

Q1

- Settlement boundaries – Urban extension study southern extension is the preferred option, the north east is not as good
- Long term desire to keep Raunds and Stanwick separate
- Send copies of the Urban Extension Study to people who request it
- Town centre – initial view is that the town centre boundary is appropriate
- Library excluded, should be included
- Also include the Saxon Hall
- Overall uncertainty regards the town centre boundary
- New access from the A45 go to proposed growth area
- Support for new growth to north of Raunds (some) if this includes a new road
- Existing traffic problems
- Support for road but no need for 500 – 1000 houses

Q2

- There is initial concern regards affordable housing and what accompanies this
- Attract undesirable characters in some cases
- Government requirement – how will affordable housing affect Raunds locally?
- Design issues for affordable housing
- People are being moved from larger urban areas into smaller centres
- Always small numbers of disaffected families

- What does affordable housing mean?
- Shared ownership, rented
- Maintenance of the infrastructure – water and electricity have problems
- 40% is too high
- Housing for elderly people is not mentioned
- Overall – little perception of affordable housing needs in Raunds
- Shortage of affordable housing for larger households
- Still many questions and concerns about anti social behaviour

Q3

- Initially against new housing
- Concern re rat running – area 2
- Vast increase in traffic 100% over 20 years
- Traffic turning etc. already problems e.g. Mountbatten Way
- Map page 40 – lack of information e.g. impact of Wrath Park – light pollution
- Access needs to be taken care of as part of the overall process
- Guarded support from one or two people in the group as long as the road is included
- Note the previous proposal for new road from Midland Road to school
- Local dispute regards extension on Raunds towards Stanwick – only direction of growth ruled out by ENC
- 1100 houses is too many
- Extension should be split
- Sewage disposal can this cope?
- We need infrastructure as part of the development proposal
- Existing problems of run off
- Over stretch water and electricity supply currently
- Site 4 – mixed use proposal, what will this include?
- There is a need for local shops as part of the development proposals
- Phasing – town centre regeneration first, there is a need for more retailing
- Some concern about the viability /possible out of town retailing

Q4

- There is no mention of Park Infants, St Peters Junior and Windmill Primary School
- There will be an impact on these also
- Currently sufficient capacity in primary school to 2010
- How will the schools expand in the longer term?
- There is a lack of space for the primary school to expand
- Need for more playing fields
- Reassurance – new playing field proposal – site 4

Q5

- Zebra crossing outside chemist – stupid scheme
- General support for overall concept of regeneration
- Parking is a big issue
- Contradicts specific proposals for redeveloping the car parks
- New parking behind the co-op
- Existing problems illegal/double parking
- Crow Spinney proposal new parking
- Site 3 – identified as new parking which is needed
- Anti pedestrian proposals for the square
- Need aesthetic approach, other improvements about the car park
- Note previous proposals – new co-op delivery bay on the opposite side of the road
- Room for delivery vehicles to the rear of the co-op a possibility?
- Other proposals for the town e.g. crime, youth centre, need for features for young people to ‘take ownership’
- Overall great constraints on the town centre development, need as much car parking as possible
- Site 1 church hall proposals already under early stages of implementation
- Saxon Hall too expensive for many groups
- Overall group opinion is support for the regeneration but with conditions – improvements to the roads, street lighting improvements and the proposals need to be the correct ones

Q6

- Do not agree with Raunds status as principal growth centre (objective 1)
- Possible other needs e.g. reopening of the police station

- Nobody can object to the principles but there is a need to get things right
- Appropriate phasing infrastructure and development
- Too much housing in one place
- Note density – overall 35 dwellings per hectare
- The devil is in the detail
- Reference to variety of transport
- Transport proposals are unrealistic e.g. buses to Wellingborough
- Development must be carefully phased
- Joined up thinking
- Infrastructure proposals need to be maintained alongside the development
- Vision and objectives are generally ok but some concerns regards the glossy view/pie in the sky

Main Points

1. Questioning the actual number of houses which is excessive there should be 500 maximum
2. Direction of growth proposal, north west,
3. Better facilities for the town as a whole, health care etc.
4. Car parking
5. Physical infrastructure/utilities

Group 7

Q1

- Misleading to call it the boundary it is only proposed
- The settlement boundary should not extend
- If we want regeneration, we need income
- There are not enough services now
- Happy with town as it is
- The Council Tax should be invested within Raunds
- Do not extend beyond Raunds old boundary

Q2

- Affordable housing will not adhere to design principles and will cause social problems
- Percentage is too high but we do need some affordable housing
- The group is divided as to the overall principle

Q3

- The area proposed for development is important for wildlife and most important approach to the town
- Other directions better from this point of view
- People need a breathing space and this will aid regeneration
- Schools will not cope
- Not enough jobs to support new population
- Where will community facilities be located?
- Agreement in principle
- To enhance facilities and school expansion
- Alternative suggestions for direction of growth
- West of London Road
- Wellingborough Road
- Why not use some other space such as allotments and cricket ground? Could locate alternative/replacement facilities on the edge of town

Q4

- Manor School needs improving and support new leisure facilities
- These could be funded from development elsewhere in the town it does not have to be area 1 and 2
- How about a new access that would use some of site 2?
- Why not more circular position for all recreational facilities and on one site e.g. land to the north

Q5

- Agree that something is needed to give the town a lift.
- Public transport need improving
- The town centre has gone down hill in recent years
- There is a need for more of a range of shops, we need community facilities
- Need facilities for young people or they hang around the town centre and open spaces
- Need more policing

Q6

- The Vision and Objectives are too vague
- Raunds is a dying town it needs to be made more attractive like Olney and Oakham

- Farmers Market an idea – not sure if the town council would push for something
- Car boot sales bring people in to spend money
- There is a feeling the town council is out of touch with possibilities and will not take the initiative
- Need to take advantage of opportunities to improve the town centre for more activities e.g. farmers market and other events
- Co-op too expensive, will not be self sufficient as a town when they have a monopoly
- Additional supermarket, could this go on the current surgery site?
- The vision and objective need to be more specific to Raunds

Main Points

1. Education provision – will not cope with grants
2. Regeneration and job opportunities
3. Protection of areas of natural beauty land to north and east of most attractive approach to the town