



Town, Village and  
Parish Design Statements for

Daventry  
Flore  
Hollowell and Teeton  
Long Buckby  
Naseby  
Norton  
Scaldwell  
Sibbertoft  
Whilton

Supplementary Planning Document

Adopted May 2008

REPORT ON CONSULTATION

Daventry District Council  
Planning Policy  
Lodge Road  
DAVENTRY  
NN11 4FP

[planningpolicy@daventrydc.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@daventrydc.gov.uk)

## Introduction

This report sets out the consultation undertaken on town, village and parish design statements for Daventry, Flore, Hollowell and Teeton, Long Buckby, Naseby, Norton, Scaldwell, Sibbertoft and Whilton. This report is required by regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, as amended.

At its meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> October 2007 the Council's Strategy Group approved the Town and Village Design Statements for the purposes of consultation. The Design Statements were accompanied by draft versions of the Sustainability Appraisals.

## Consultation

Consultation commenced on 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2007. Over 700 letters and emails were sent to organisations, town and parish councils and individuals who were listed on the Councils' database.

## Publicity

The draft SPD was posted on the planning consultation section of the Councils' websites.

The Council placed advertisements in the Daventry Express and the Northampton Chronicle and Echo. A copy of the advertisement is included at Appendix A.

## Consultation Period

Consultation took place with organisations and local residents on these documents for a period of 6 weeks until 4.30pm on 14th December 2007.

## Comments received.

5 organisations responded to all the documents indicating that they had no observations to make. 2 organisations made comments relevant to all of the documents.

In addition the following number of representations were received Daventry 3, Flore 2, Hollowell and Teeton 2, Long Buckby 4, Naseby 2, Norton 2, Scaldwell 5, Sibbertoft 8 and Whilton 4. Appendix B contains a summary of all the representations and the changes made to the draft documents as a result of the representations.. Copies of the full representations can be viewed at the Council's offices by prior appointment.

## Consideration of Responses

The representations were reported to Daventry District Council's Planning Committee on 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2008 and the Strategy Group on 17<sup>th</sup> April 2008, followed by Full Council on 15<sup>th</sup> May 2008 when the documents were adopted. As a result of their consideration of the reports Members required further changes to the design statements as set out in appendix E.

## Advertisement

### DAVENTRY DISTRICT COUNCIL

#### PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT (2004)

#### MIDDLEMORE DEVELOPMENT AREA, DAVENTRY SITE 7,8,9 - DEVELOPMENT BRIEF (CONSULTATION DRAFT) AND SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL (CONSULTATION DRAFT)

&

#### PARISH, VILLAGE, TOWN DESIGN STATEMENTS FOR DAVENTRY, FLORE, HOLLOWELL AND TEETON, LONG BUCKBY, NASEBY, NORTON, SCALDWELL, SIBBERTOFT, WHILTON (SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT -CONSULTATION DRAFTS) AND SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL (CONSULTATION DRAFTS)

A draft Development Brief and accompanying draft Sustainability Appraisal have been prepared for the Site 7,8,9 Middlemore Development Area, Daventry. Parish, Village and Town Design Statements have been prepared for Daventry, Flore, Hollowell and Teeton, Long Buckby, Naseby, Norton, Scaldwell, Sibbertoft, Whilton with accompanying draft Sustainability Appraisals.

The District Council's Strategy Group has resolved to invite comments on the documents. The Development Brief and Design Statements, when adopted, will supplement the policies and proposals of the Local Plan/ Local Development Framework. The accompanying Sustainability Appraisals provide an analysis of relevant sustainability issues.

The Council welcomes comments from any interested party on the documents. The documents will be available during the consultation period for inspection at Daventry District Council, Lodge Road, Daventry; the libraries at Daventry, Moulton, Kingsthorpe, Long Buckby, Woodford Halse and Brixworth; and the Council's Outreach Centres at Woodford Halse, Brixworth and Long Buckby during normal opening hours.

A copy will also be available on the Council's website [www.daventrydc.gov.uk/atoz/planning1/consult.shtml](http://www.daventrydc.gov.uk/atoz/planning1/consult.shtml)

Comments in writing should be forwarded to Karen Britton, Senior Planning Officer, Daventry District Council, Lodge Road, Daventry, Northamptonshire, NN11 4FP or e-mail [kbritton@daventrydc.gov.uk](mailto:kbritton@daventrydc.gov.uk) by **4.30pm on Friday 14<sup>th</sup> December 2007** at the latest. Comments cannot be accepted after this time.

Simon Bovey  
Executive Director

***RESPONSES TO TOWN, PARISH and VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENTS (CONSULTATION DRAFTS)***

Responses below have been set out with those who made no comments first, followed by those who made comments common to all of the Design Statements, then those who made responses to specific Design Statements (see index below). The Senior Planning Officer has also made comments for some Design Statements and some Design Groups themselves have proposed additional changes and are highlighted as “Design Group” under the Respondee section.

Daventry	page 15	Norton	page 58
Flore	page 24	Scaldwell	page 63
Hollowell and Teeton	page 32	Sibbertoft	page 74
Long Buckby	page 38	Whilton	page 86
Naseby	page 50		

Key: DS = Design Statement    DG = Design Group

<b>Respondee</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Changes to Design Statement</b>
<b>No Comments</b>			
The Theatres Trust	No Comment	N/A	N/A
Network Rail	No Comment	N/A	N/A
Anglian Water	Fully support document, no further comment	N/A	N/A
The National Trust	No Comment	N/A	N/A
English Heritage	No Comment – happy for these to be dealt	N/A	N/A

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	with at local level by DDC Conservation Officer		
<b>Comments Common to All DS</b>			
Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue (FRS)	<p><u>Building Regulations</u> The design statements will potentially cover a mixture of domestic and non-domestic developments. Therefore, when considering new builds, The Building Regulations 2000, Fire Safety, Approved Document B volumes 1 and 2, should be consulted.</p> <p><u>Service Infrastructure</u> Any large scale developments may have implications in relation to existing fire and rescue service premises, fire and community safety and emergency response resources.</p>	<p>Point noted – no action needed as Building Regulations have to be considered by all Developers</p> <p>Currently, the Fire and Rescue Service are consulted on applications that case officers consider relevant. It is proposed that further work be carried out by DDC with the FRS to establish a checklist re-FRS issues. Amend DS to refer to this as a general statement:</p> <p>“Developers are advised that at the time of publication of this Design Statement, the District Council were working with the Fire and Rescue Service to</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Amend DS and DDC to liaise with FRS re- preparing checklist.</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>Where deemed necessary, the service will be seeking developer contributions for the capital element through section 106 funding streams.</p> <p><u>Water Supplies</u> Historical data indicates that for approximately every 50 properties built, one fire hydrant is required in areas of residential risk. Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service undertake a risk assessed approach with regards to identifying locations and number of fire hydrants required, and therefore will wish to be fully consulted on this matter.</p> <p>The Service would seek to secure appropriate developer contributions towards this provision.</p>	<p>prepare a checklist of FRS design issues. Developers are therefore advised to contact the LPA regarding any requirements".</p> <p>The Infrastructure Interim SPD adopted (Sept.2004) highlights contributions for FRS, therefore the principle is in place already. However, text shall be added in DS to highlight more generally that: "Developer contributions may be required as part of development and Developers shall refer to current supplementary guidance on this".</p> <p>DDC and FRS to prepare a FRS checklist.</p> <p>As previous comment – contributions to be referred to in DS</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>DDC to liaise with FRS re- preparing checklist</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p><u>Fire Appliance Access</u> It is noted in a number of the design statements that there are issues with road side parking which in turn has an impact on road access.</p> <p>Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service encourages that the following comments are included within each design statement to ensure that developers consult with the Fire and Rescue Service when designing access to any new development to ensure emergency access is maintain to allow operational response times to be met. In addition, Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service wish to be consulted on any parking schemes, including kerb side parking within developments.</p> <p>When considering the building of new dwellings, the 'Building Regulations 2000 - Fire Safety, Approved Document B volume 1 (Dwelling houses)' should be consulted. Section 11 of this guidance refers to fire service vehicular access. Table 8 within section 11 makes reference to specific minimum dimensions, which must be adhered to in order to allow fire appliance access.</p> <p>Please note that Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service operate vehicles that</p>	<p>This issue will be monitored by DDC.</p> <p>To be incorporated in to FRS checklist</p> <p>Point noted – no action needed as Building Regulations have to be considered by all Developers</p> <p>To be incorporated in to FRS checklist</p>	<p>Monitor</p> <p>DDC to liaise with FRS re- preparing checklist</p> <p>None</p> <p>DDC to liaise with FRS re- preparing checklist</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>are outside of the ranges stated. These differences are:</p> <p>Weight  Pump appliances – 14 tonnes  High Reach – 25 tonnes  Combined aerial and pump appliances (CARP) – 26 tonnes</p> <p>Significant changes to our safe systems of work have been implemented as a consequence of recently introduced legislation, particularly with regard to working at height. This has resulted in a greater use of our high reach appliances when dealing with property fires. Given the heavier mass and dimensions of these vehicles we would welcome early consultation when considering vehicular access to any proposed development.</p> <p>Where roadside parking is permitted, particularly on residential developments, it can prove difficult for fire appliances to manoeuvre in between parked cars when attending incidents, especially if the road is not particularly wide. Where this occurs, it can affect the service meeting operational response times. On residential developments a large proportion of the incidents could be 'life risk' and therefore reaching the incident in the quickest time</p>	<p>To be incorporated in to FRS checklist</p>	<p>DDC to liaise with FRS re- preparing checklist</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>possible is imperative.</p> <p>Therefore the Service wishes to be consulted when developers look at the various options of kerbside parking to ensure emergency access is considered when planning road access and parking schemes. Potential design options could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kerbside parking prohibited on main roads within developments</li> <li>• Off road parking bays or lay-bys provided as an alternative to kerbside parking</li> <li>• Kerbside parking only allowed on one side of the road to ensure traffic can still flow</li> <li>• Road widths made wide enough where kerbside parking is allowed to take into account the possibility of fire appliance access in the event of an emergency</li> </ul> <p><u>Community Safety</u> Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service is keen to promote the concept of designing safety into any new building scheme and to also reduce the opportunities for arson.</p> <p>Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service have a number of departments, such as Fire Protection and Fire Prevention, who</p>	<p>The need to consult FRS to be highlighted through checklist.</p> <p>It is highlighted that highways are designed and built to Northamptonshire County Council highway standards, however parking will be monitored</p> <p>FRS contacts to be included on checklist.</p>	<p>DDC to liaise with FRS re- preparing checklist</p> <p>Monitor</p> <p>DDC to liaise with FRS re- preparing checklist</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>can offer advice on fire safety when designing building schemes. In addition, the Service has an Arson Task Force (a partnership between Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service and Northamptonshire Police), which looks at reducing arson across the county.</p> <p>The Service also has a District Liaison Officer who covers the Daventry area and would be able to act as a reference point between the developers and the Fire Service as well as providing guidance and advice.</p> <p>Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service would encourage developers to consider installing the following types of community fire safety measures in all developments within Daventry District, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Installation of appropriate hard wired fire detection systems in all dwellings</li> <li>• Smoke extraction systems to protect communal means of escape</li> <li>• Provision of barriers in open space areas to prevent abandoned vehicle issues</li> <li>• Lighting and surveillance systems</li> </ul>	<p>This is already a requirement of Building Regulations</p> <p>To be incorporated in to FRS checklist</p> <p>To be incorporated in to FRS checklist</p> <p>DS refer to lighting already – no</p>	<p>None</p> <p>DDC to liaise with FRS re- preparing checklist</p> <p>DDC to liaise with FRS re- preparing checklist</p> <p>None/ DDC to liaise with FRS re-</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Installation of appropriate security measures</li> <li>• Adequate waste management facilities (wheelie bin stores)</li> </ul> <p>With regards to the provision of wheelie bin stores, we ask that careful consideration is given to the siting of storage facilities for wheelie bins in both domestic and non-domestic developments. It is essential that such facilities are not situated too close to dwellings or non domestic properties in order to prevent the opportunity for arson. The involvement of wheelie bins in fires is often not recognised, so it is essential that Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service are consulted upon designs around these facilities. The Arson Task Force, in particular, would be able to provide advice and guidance on this.</p> <p>When considering the location for such waste facilities, in addition to consulting the Building Regulations 2000, Fire Safety documents, the Building Regulations Approved Document H – Drainage and</p>	<p>change needed/ Surveillance systems to be incorporated in to FRS checklist</p> <p>DS to be amended to include this as a general guideline (see below*)</p> <p>To be incorporated in to DS as a general guideline (see below*)</p> <p>Point noted – no action needed as Building Regulations have to be considered by all Developers</p>	<p>preparing checklist</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>None</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>Waste Disposal (2002 edition) should also be consulted.</p> <p>It is also important to note that Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service encourage the use of residential sprinkler systems in new dwellings which may be deemed high risk, such as social housing, and would like this to be referenced within the document to allow developers to consider these systems.</p> <p>Such systems can be relatively low cost to install if installation takes place during the build, and are a proven means of reducing the number of fire deaths and injuries that would occur as a result of dwelling fires</p>	<p>DS to be amended to encourage incorporation of sprinklers – linked to provision of appropriate security measures – propose following general security guidelines to be incorporated in all DS *:          “All development shall be designed to be secure”.</p> <p>“Developers are required to provide sufficient space for secure waste bin and box storage within units e.g within a garage, to reduce opportunities for anti-social behaviour. Developers are advised that at the time of adoption of this Design Statement, the District Council issues residents with 2 x 240 litre bins and 2 kerbside boxes of 40 and 55 litres. However, Developers are advised to contact the Council’s Waste Team for current advice”.</p> <p>“Developers are encouraged to consider incorporating sprinkler systems within all new units”</p>	<p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
<p>Northamptonshire Teaching Primary Care Trust</p>	<p>Brief principles which we would like to see incorporated into any new developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusion of affordable housing</li>   <li>• Provision of walking and cycling opportunities with links to local services and amenities</li>   <li>• Access to green spaces and recreation opportunities</li>   <li>• Ensuring that crime and fear of crime is 'designed out' where there may be a risk eg through adequate street lighting.</li> </ul>	<p>Affordable Housing should only be included in a Design Statement, if referring to design specifically e.g all housing whether private or affordable should be designed to the same high design standards. It is suggested that all DS be amended to highlight this point.</p> <p>Where DS have not referred to design of good walking/cycling links to local services/amenities, the DS should be amended to include this.</p> <p>Where DS have not referred to these access opportunities, the DS should be amended to include this.</p> <p>Where DS have not referred to security, this should be incorporated and the SPG Planning Out Crime in Northamptonshire should be cross-referenced.</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS where applicable</p> <p>Amend DS where applicable</p> <p>Amend DS where applicable</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
<b>Area Specific Comments</b>			
<b>Daventry Town and Parish Design Statement</b>			
British Waterways	<p>Proposed canal basin is planned. Consider - good links to basin and town centre via pedestrian links and signage, as well as extending design philosophy of town centre to basin.</p> <p>Design Statements are to be welcomed as a positive step.</p>	<p>This is already dealt with in existing points in Town Centre/Outer Urban</p> <p>Comment welcomed</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
Croudace	<p>Given that the term 'Town' applies to both the town centre and the Parish of Daventry is it valid for the DS to stipulate that buildings should not be more than 2.5 – 3 storeys high in the Town ? - (see point 1 on page 10). Such a design principle would appear to conflict with the principles set out in Daventry District Council's own Design Code, which states at paragraph 6.8.2: "...Within medium / high density development, landmark buildings should be at least 3 storeys in height."</p> <p><i>Also within the District Council's Design Code chapter 8, which deals with new urban extensions, paragraph 8.14.4</i></p>	<p>The building heights as set out in the draft Design Statement are still supported, however it is acknowledged that in certain cases buildings of a greater height could be appropriate. Add additional text to acknowledge that buildings of public or landmark status buildings could exceed these heights.</p>	<p>Replace first sentence in para 1 on page 10 with</p> <p>'Buildings should not be more than 2 1/2 - 3 storeys high in the town. Exceptional quality buildings that are of public or landmark status may be considered in excess of this height limit. The scale of buildings should take into account the topography and location of the land.'</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p><i>includes the following sentence: "...The local centre should be characterised by continuous frontage development with a significant number of buildings up to four storeys high."</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, it is our understanding from various discussions with Council representatives that consideration is being given to a substantial element of four storey development in association with the proposed Daventry Waterside.</i></p> <p>From the above we would suggest that the issue of height limitation set out in the Daventry Town and Parish Design Statement requires some reconsideration, or clearer qualification.</p>		
<p>Turley Associates for Danetree Village</p>	<p><b>TOWN CENTRE / OUTER URBAN</b></p> <p><i>"Buildings should not be more than 2.5-3 storeys high in the town (the scale of the buildings should take into account the topography and location of the land). The Developers' Design Statement shall identify/ show how new building will merge into the existing landscape".</i></p> <p>This policy is overly restrictive and could compromise the efficient use of land. Whilst it is of course very important to regard a site's surroundings, in some circumstances this can lead to unnecessary restrictions on development. National policy dictates that densities should be increased, and this is especially</p>	<p>The building heights as set out in the draft Design Statement are still supported, however it is acknowledged that in certain cases buildings of a greater height could be appropriate. Add additional text to acknowledge that buildings of public or landmark status buildings could exceed these heights</p>	<p>Replace first sentence in para 1 on page 10 with</p> <p>'Buildings should not be more than 2 1/2 - 3 storeys high in the town. Exceptional quality buildings that are of public or landmark status may be considered in excess of this height limit. The scale of buildings should take into account the topography and location of the land.'</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>relevant in Daventry and the South Midlands region, which has been designated as a growth area. Building at only 2.5 - 3 storeys where higher densities could easily be accommodated would adversely impact on this policy objective for making the most efficient use of land. If development occurs strategically and at higher densities more sustainable communities can be built. Higher densities mean that there should be less land-take, therefore safeguarding land from unnecessary and inappropriate development. A higher density is essential in providing a critical mass, which can support itself and provide a sustainable community.</p> <p>Limited higher density development at this scale is entirely appropriate and should not be unreasonably prevented by this draft wording. Four storey buildings can be successful and appropriate if they are developed sensitively. We suggest the inclusion of the following additional wording, <i>“four storey development is acceptable in emerging village centres”</i>.</p> <p>In large scale developments, the built edge should be designed to “crumble” at the edges in order that the overall impact is reduced. Higher density and larger scale development is more appropriate in the centre of new developments.</p>		

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p><i>“Avoid large-scale repetition of modern standard pattern-book designs- new buildings should reflect those of Daventry as a traditional market town; see ‘Character and Daventry Design Codes”.</i></p> <p>Any new development's main objective should be to have exemplary architecture of the highest quality. Daventry was originally a market town and has a relatively small town centre. It is important to draw inspiration where favourable from the site's context and surroundings. A large part of the town has suffered from inappropriate development through the 1960s and 1970s with a large number of “suburban style” low density developments. Developments should identify “the genius” of the place and use this context to provide guidance to create appropriate buildings and spaces for the locality.</p> <p>Design codes should outline acceptable development; however these should have an element of flexibility in order that they can be progressed through the development phasing inline with current policy.</p> <p><i>“The materials palette should include varied red and brown brick/type bond, Northamptonshire ironstone, frost resistant F1 grad engineering bricks to be used for</i></p>	<p>Amend DS to clarify this point:  “ Avoid .... market town. Developers shall therefore incorporate local design characteristics, however these can be given a contemporary and/or innovative element. The Daventry Design Codes SPD provides further design advice”.</p> <p>Amend DS to highlight that these are examples:  <i>“The materials palette should be sympathetic to the local area, for</i></p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p><i>brick copings</i> . This is an unreasonably prescriptive as a requirement. There is no problem with indicating appropriate materials or similar but it is not right to make these a requirement.</p> <p>11. <i>"In all areas there should be some Public Art incorporated and displayed such as statues and wall decorations to enliven the street scene"</i>.</p> <p>The request to have public art "in all areas" is inappropriate and unnecessary. This approach to public art is naïve and ill considered and almost certainly would lead to second rate "installations". It would be preferable by far to encourage a strategic approach to public art ensuring coherent integration and well considered genuinely appropriate interventions in the public realm. Public art is an important part of the street scene and when successful integrated into the street adds positive effect. There is a danger with public art that it can be gratuitous and appears out of place and unrelated to the environment. When an 'ad-hoc' approach is taken to providing public art it can appear as clutter and can become an inappropriate use of funding.</p>	<p><i>example varied red and brown brick/type bond, Northamptonshire ironstone, frost resistant F1 grad engineering bricks for brick copings are some examples of local design materials that Developers may incorporate"</i>.</p> <p>Amend DS to instead state that: "Developers are required at pre-application stage to consult the Local Planning Authority and Daventry Town Council over requirements for incorporating public art in to new development. Public art could include statues, wall decorations etc, however all should enliven the street scene and have a long-term maintenance plan".</p>	<p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>Successful public art integrates into the streetscene and can be more subtle in concept such as the use of lighting, hard landscaping and intelligent planting schemes. Children's play areas are also suitable locations for integration.</p> <p>12. <i>"There should be some "focus" buildings to provide interesting features. These must be in keeping with the character of the location".</i></p> <p>Variety in building styles is welcomed although they should be in keeping with an underlying overall architectural theme to avoid an ad-hoc appearance which can be inappropriate and reduce the overall appearance of the area. Architectural features can add interest to buildings without being overbearing and are often more appropriate than a token number of "focus buildings" throughout the development. There is always a danger in promoting over use of the 'landmark building'. In urban design terms it is always much better to consider coherent groups of buildings rather than individual 'focus' buildings.</p> <p>13. <i>"The surface treatment of pavements, footpaths and alleyways should complement the variety of textures and tone shown in surrounding buildings or landscape".</i></p> <p>It is more suitable to agree a limited</p>	<p>The existing Daventry Design Codes SPD refers to grouping buildings as a design focus, however suggest amend DS to also highlight this.</p> <p>The Daventry Design Codes SPD already highlights a colour/material palette – The DS shall cross-reference to this.</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>palette of materials and textures, which will ensure consistency. A variety of textures and surfaces provides interest into the streetscene and the urban environment. However, too many different styles can make an overall confused effect and dilute the overall effect. If different textures are to be used a coherent strategy should be implemented in order to provide the area with an overall image. Further it is always preferable to identify a limited palette of high quality materials to ensure consistency, cost effectiveness and ease of maintenance.</p> <p><i>17. "Sufficient off road parking should be provided for developments – commercial / retail areas should provide adequate facilities but encourage use of car sharing in line with SPG parking".</i></p> <p>To meet sustainability objectives, new developments should have the minimum parking requirements in order to promote the use of public transport and other modes (walking/ cycling) where possible. Public transport facilities should be improved in order that it provides a real alternative to the car. The creation of parking courts should be avoided for aesthetic and safety reasons.</p>	<p>Amend DS to state instead that: "Parking requirements shall be in line with SPD Parking".</p>	<p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>22. <i>“Public open spaces with seating and courtyard areas should be features incorporated in any development”.</i> Public open spaces should be developed where most appropriate in order that they are used. A successful townscape strategy would define informal urban areas that could be used for seating. “Courtyards” are generally inappropriate for these uses because without critical mass of pedestrian movement they become isolated and dangerous to use.</p> <p><b>OUTER URBAN DEVELOPMENTS</b> <i>“Any new housing areas to be designed with varied and “interesting” buildings”</i> We agree that monotonous, uninspiring development is not acceptable, although the urge to use a number of conflicting architectural styles within new housing areas should be avoided. It has been noted above that architectural features are often more appropriate than a number of landmark buildings which can reduce the overall visual appearance of an area. Using many different architectural styles, colours, textures and materials can dilute the overall effect of an area. It is more important to ensure that houses are designed to the highest quality than the amount of different architectural styles included.</p>	<p>Amend DS to state instead : “Developers are required at pre-application stage to consider and consult with the Local Planning Authority and Daventry Town Council over any requirements for the provision of public open spaces with seating”.</p> <p>Amend DS to clarify this point: “Any new housing areas shall be designed to the highest quality, incorporating interesting individual or grouped buildings as features in the streetscene. Monotonous, poor quality design will not be acceptable”.</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>3. <i>“Public art is encouraged, in particular at roundabouts to depict local history and business interest”.</i>            Not all locations are suitable for public art and an overriding strategy is generally more appropriate and successful. We have already commented on the suitability of public art within developments. A strategic approach to public art is more appropriate with the use of lighting, hard landscaping and intelligent planting schemes. Using public art at roundabouts will encourage an “ad-hoc” approach, which will lessen the overall effect of any interventions. Roundabouts are not always the most suitable locations for public art and the overall effect of the art piece can be lost.</p> <p>9. <i>“Major commerce and all industry should be appropriately located with respect to residential areas in order to reduce pollution and potential environmental health issues”.</i>            Industry and major commerce should be located at the edges of new developments, adjacent to transport links of developments to ensure that related traffic is kept to a minimum throughout the development.</p> <p>10. <i>“Developments of retail, commercial,</i></p>	<p>The DS states as referred to opposite that public art is <u>encouraged</u> and highlights roundabouts as one area where the Design Group feel this to be useful. As this is not stated as a “requirement”, this point does not require amending, although the points made by the consultee are noted.</p> <p>The DS concerns design, not location of land uses. The existing DS shall be amended to clarify this by replacing the term “located” with ‘sited’ and including the new term “designed”.</p> <p>The DS states “might”, however</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p><i>industrial, leisure or community use are required to incorporate areas of public open space within their layout. These might include courtyard areas etc”.</i></p> <p>”Courtyards” are generally inappropriate for these uses because without critical mass of pedestrian movement they become isolated and dangerous to use. These public open spaces should be part of a strategic open space network.</p> <p>11. <i>“Screening of commercial and industrial areas with soft planting, to assist in mitigating against noise and light pollution to be part of the overall design”.</i></p> <p>Any major development which involves commercial or industrial uses should be mitigated through an integrated landscape strategy.</p> <p>13. <i>Attention should be paid to the topography of the land. Tall buildings should be put on lower levels to heights not exceeding 2.5-3 storey with the high land only used for 1-2 storey buildings; the sky-scape should be maintained to retain the feel of a historic market town</i></p> <p>Development that is outside the town centre should not be restricted by precedents set in the “historic market town”. Please see above (para 10. pg 3) for our response to the restrictions on</p>	<p>the point is noted and the last sentence referring to courtyards as an example shall be removed.</p> <p>Amend DS to highlight “..overall design and form part of an integrated landscape strategy”</p> <p>As previous comments, amend DS to be in line with Design Codes SPD</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>building heights.</p> <p><i>14. "Sites of archaeological and special interest such as Burnt Walls and Borough Hill should be protected and enhanced. Both these areas are Scheduled Ancient Monuments and should be conserved appropriately to retain their historic value".</i></p> <p>Borough Hill can be both protected and enhanced whilst providing improved opportunity for leisure uses by the local community. If large scale development occurs information should be provided on how these areas will be accommodated within it without being adversely affected. Descriptions and illustrations should be provided regarding how existing developments such as Burnt Walls could be successfully integrated into new developments.</p> <p><b>Appendix 2 – Wish List</b></p> <p><i>1. "All available brownfield sites in and around the Town Centre should be built on first before green field sites are developed".</i></p> <p>We strongly disagree with this statement. We agree that where appropriate development should come forward on brownfield land but note that small piecemeal development will not provide the critical mass that a</p>	<p>Amend DS to include :  "Developers are required to provide with their planning application, evidence (both written and visual), regarding how the development will conserve and enhance any sites of archaeological or special interest".</p> <p>The Wish List section as stated in the DS carries no planning weight at all and purely highlights issues collected by the Design Group as part of the DS preparation – it is contained for information purposes only. These comments are therefore noted, but no amendments are required.</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>None</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>sustainable urban extension will. Large scale strategic development is able to provide as well as housing, associated community facilities which will be available by all. The Daventry Urban Capacity Study (2005) highlighted that the estimated capacity for Daventry town centre within the plan period (2004-2024) was only 175 dwellings. We support the delivery of future strategic growth through a sustainable urban extension which will provide the critical mass to support associates community facilities and transport links.</p> <p><i>3. "Borough Hill and Burnt Walls to be protected from development"</i></p> <p>A strategic large scale development proposal would provide protection for Borough Hill and Burnt Walls. This is less likely to occur if piecemeal development which could infringe on both of these sites.</p> <p><i>5. "Stop building 2.5+ storeys on elevated sites"</i></p> <p>This request is too simplistic a statement and each site should be viewed in its own circumstances. This policy could restrict development and lead to the inefficient use of land. The implications of this have already been described above (<a href="#">para10. pg 3</a>).</p>		
Daventry District Council -	Overall this is a very good design statement, succinct and to the point.	Welcome comment	None

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
Conservation Officer	<p>Page 10 6. Joints should be thin as well as using an appropriate mortar mix.</p> <p>Page 13 5. Shopfronts – repetition of “plastic”</p> <p>figure 8 – this is a poor example of shop signage. It is plastic with raised lettering, the proportions of the fascias are oversized and do not respect the proportions of the building. The fascias overhang the top of the shop windows and the lighting is prominent poorly designed strip lighting. Please could a more traditional fascia be used?</p> <p>8. Would it be worth mentioning “and screened where possible”?</p> <p>Page 15 23. This guideline appears to contradict itself stating, “Green verges are an important characteristic” but then goes on to say, “Grass verges should be kept to a minimum”. Can this be clarified to prevent confusion? Is it specifically grass verges which are an issue rather than verges with planting, landscaping etc.</p>	<p>Amend DS to highlight this</p> <p>Amend DS for typo</p> <p>Amend DS with new photo</p> <p>Amend DS to highlight this wording</p> <p>DS to be clarified to highlight that “Green verges are an important characteristic of Daventry. Where new grass verges are proposed as part of a development, developers shall ensure that responsibilities for ownership/maintenance are clearly identified within the Design and Access Statement”</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue	<p><b><u>Town Centre/Outer Urban</u></b></p> <p><u>Points 17, 21 and 27 (Pages 11 and 12)</u> Although Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service welcome points made on allowing emergency access, it is essential that the document reflects that developers need to consult with the Fire and Rescue Service when designing access to any new development to ensure emergency access is maintained, allowing operational response times to be met.</p> <p><u>Point 23 (Page 12)</u> Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service is keen to promote the concept of designing safety into any new building scheme and to also reduce the opportunities for arson, and welcomes the reference point to community safety included within the document. However, we ask that in addition to the Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor being consulted on such issues, a further point is added asking that the Fire and Rescue Service is consulted with when designing building schemes.</p> <p><b><u>Outer Urban Developments</u></b></p> <p><u>Points 1 and 2 (Page 17)</u> Please note the comments detailed earlier within the document relating to community safety and design also apply to these</p>	<p>Amend DS to advise Developers to consult FRS for advice at pre-application</p> <p>Amend DS to refer Developers to consult FRS for advice at pre-application</p> <p>The concept of community safety and design is an overarching principle and the DS will be reviewed to ensure</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>points made within the document.</p> <p><u>Point 19 (Page 18)</u> Please note the comments detailed earlier in this response regarding fire appliance access and off road parking also apply to this point.</p>	<p>that this is clear.</p> <p>This provides a summary of the document principles and where applicable will be updated to take on board comments made above</p>	<p>Amend DS as applicable</p>
<p><b>Flore Village Design Statement</b></p>			
<p>Daventry District Council - Conservation</p>	<p>Cover photos – second row up, second from right is a bad example with PVCu window and door and top opening vent</p> <p>Buildings in Flore Page 7 Line 1 – It would be worth putting some dates round the “buildings of different ages”</p> <p>Line 28 – “use of materials that make reference to the locality” would be better to state “local materials” as these will retain the vernacular. There is an argument that the right type and colouring of artificial stone “makes reference to the locality” it’s always good to be more specific.</p> <p>Line 34 – the brackets around “introduced after the advent of canal and rail transport and usually post 1840” are not required.</p>	<p>Amend DS to replace photo</p> <p>Amend DS to insert general dates</p> <p>Amend DS to highlight suggested text change</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>Area Photographs Page 13 – Could a photo of Bricketts Lane without the snow be used. Although it is very atmospheric snow tends to cover the features these photographs are trying to illustrate i.e. road surfacing, footpath/verge treatments, boundary treatments.</p> <p>Map Page 14 – Use different colours for illustration purposes, shades of green are difficult to distinguish especially as the quality of printed material can vary even within the same print run.</p> <p>A good set of guidelines.</p>	<p>Amend DS as suggested</p> <p>Amend DS to replace photo</p> <p>Amend DS to make colour differences clearer</p> <p>Comments welcomed</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>None</p>
British Waterways	Would like to see signage, either brown or fingerpost from the settlement to the canal system and the development of circular walks – where there is a village pub, pub walks would be welcomed	The DS is about design issues therefore the points re- walk promotion are just noted. However, the DS shall be amended to include – “promotion of appropriately designed recreation signage”.	Amend DS
Design Group	<p>New text to describe views attached as Appendix 3</p> <p>Add new text page 22 para.4 to include the original village green. “...where the village sign stands. The original village green lies</p>	<p>Include new text and photos as proposed in Appendix 3, subject to updating letter referencing</p> <p>Amend DS to include former green as per suggested text</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>at the junction of The Green and Chapel Lane and included the stocks and a lock-up until 1834. This is now a private garden, however much remains visible over a low hedge”.</p> <p>Amend text page 25 – “Historical orchards ..... The remaining orchard should be.....”.</p>	<p>Amend DS to include text amendment</p>	<p>Amend DS</p>
<p>Senior Planning Officer</p>	<p>The following amendments are recommended:</p> <p>Page 4 Point 2: “It is important.....and increased in appropriate locations”.</p> <p>Page 6 Point 1 outside of the control of planning, therefore more appropriate as a Preference. Point 2 – a land use, rather than design issue, hence move to Preference. Point 6 – again move to Preference, as this is a land use issue.</p> <p>Page 19 Photos need to be labelled to identify what and where they are and one of the top two photos replaced, as these are almost identical.</p> <p>Page 25 Point 5 Change wording to “Retain large...in gardens and in public open spaces”.</p>	<p>Amend as per these amendments</p>	<p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>Discussion has taken place with the DG about the historic orchards and as a result of this the following change is proposed on page 22 - insert additional new 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph: "Orchards have been highlighted already in this Design Statement as an important historical landscape feature of the village. The last remaining orchard lies between King's Lane and Chapel Lane (see Map 2). The orchard tree canopies are visible from both roads, with a further glimpsed view of the orchard provided from Chapel Lane. The Community would like to see this historic landscape feature retained and appropriately managed".</p>	<p>Amend as proposed and amend guideline page 25: "...maps 1 and 2. The community encourage the remaining area of orchard to be retained to..."</p>	
<p><b>Hollowell and Teeton Village Design Statement</b></p>			
<p>Daventry District Council - Conservation</p>	<p>Page 26 - Line 8 – should read "painted softwood window frames" as this is the prevalent traditional window treatment.</p> <p>Line 9 – remove the word "collyweston" as this refers to stone roofs not clay tiles.</p> <p>Line 24 – "The Council House" should be plural</p> <p>Line 26 &amp; 33 – Are the "grey tiled roofs" referred to concrete tiles? If so this should</p>	<p>Amend DS as per comment</p> <p>Amend DS as per comment</p> <p>Amend DS as per comment</p> <p>DS Group to check and amend DS as applicable</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS if applicable</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>be noted.</p> <p>Page 28 - Line 16 – the inverted commas around council housing should be removed.</p> <p>Line 19 – the description of the housing could read “original simple semi detached” as this is slightly more explicit.</p> <p>Line 22/23 – Reference to pre/post 19<sup>th</sup> century is unclear – would be better to clarify instead by stating which precise addresses in this area do not have off street parking</p> <p>Line 25 – Does this paragraph mean linear development/no backland development? It may be worth explicitly mentioning this.</p> <p>Page 30 - Line 4 - The passage from Pevsner is incorrectly quoted.</p> <p>Line 17 – “post holiday villa style” what date is this from? As an architectural historian it is a style I’ve never heard of! May wish to re-word this?</p> <p>Line 20 – This should be made clearer – reflects the fashions of which period? I assume this is saying that development reflected the architectural fashions of the day. It may be worth making more of this, as this is very definite architectural</p>	<p>Amend DS as per comment</p> <p>Amend DS as per comment</p> <p>Amend DS to clarify this</p> <p>Amend DS to clarify that: “Due to a high proportion of linear development, nearly all...”</p> <p>Revise with correct wording</p> <p>Amend DS to clarify</p> <p>Amend DS as proposed</p>	<p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>developmental history of the village. It may be adding to the final paragraph of the page "All of which reflect the period in which they were built".</p> <p>Page 32 - These are a very good set of building guidelines! Please could numbering guidelines be considered? This is for clarity and for easy reference, especially in reports.</p> <p>Page 33 - Please could the final guideline read "Any person wishing to do works to any listed building" as there is sometimes a fine line between repair and alteration. For example replacing roof timbers are part of an overall roof repair would require an application.</p> <p>Page 39 - Line 13 – Gravel strips and French drains are not the same thing, although gravel strips are required with French drains. Please can this read "Gravel strips incorporating French Drains can be introduced"?</p> <p>Page 40 - Line 7 – should this read "Now try standing closer to the house and <i>noting</i> the details of the building ..."?</p> <p>Line 25 – Please can this read, "Will the changes affect <i>the setting</i> of notable local landmark features ..."?</p>	<p>Welcome comment. Amend DS to provide clearer referencing</p> <p>Amend DS as per text</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>Line 30 – Please can this read “Will the proposed alterations interfere with <i>important</i> views ...”</p> <p>Line 33 – Please can this read “Finally it is suggested that you check your ideas with a builder or an architect <i>and</i> the Local Planning Authority (DDC) who may suggest improvements, especially if your building is listed”?</p>	<p>Amend DS as per text</p> <p>Amend DS as per text</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>
<p>Bidwells for JE Lucas Ltd</p>	<p>Document submission made – the following is a brief summary of key points made.</p> <p>Whilst acknowledging the work that has gone into the preparation of the document; our Client objects to the Village Design Statement (VDS) in its present form -The VDS seeks to afford what we consider to be undue protection to our clients land interest. The document is based upon subjective opinion and does not appear to be based upon a factual evidence base with particular regards to the importance of views in and out of the village. The impartiality of the Steering Group when deciding these "important views" is questionable given the proximity (adjacent to our Clients land) of the Steering Group Co-ordinator. This is compounded by the fact that in respect of our Clients land the document is contrary to the opinions of the</p>	<p>The Senior Planning Officer has now checked this site and confirms that whilst there are views from the end of Spring Close northwards across this field down to the Creaton Road dwellings and further to the attractive sloping landscape beyond, the site in itself cannot be justified as an Important Open Space.</p>	<p>Amend DS to remove as Important Open Space</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>professional officers of Daventry District Council; who support in principle the development of the site for affordable housing development to meet local need. Clearly, professional judgement is that the site is not an important open space in the village, which should be retained. This is confirmed by our initial Visual Impact Assessment of the site (submitted separately). The thrust of the document appears to be to restrict development, which is contrary to national guidance on the preparation of Village Design Statements. Furthermore, the document seeks to protect our clients land interest from development on an unsound policy justification. This is contrary to Planning Policy Statement 12. The document is pre-emptive of the Core Strategy and Site Allocations elements of the LDF process and should not be used to in effect define a settlement boundary. In accordance with PPS12 such actions need to be tested through the examination process.</p> <p>Accordingly, we object to the VDS in its present form. Given the future role an adopted document would have in the Development Control process, further work needs to be undertaken to ensure that the document is both accurate and defensible. The undue protection sought in respect of our clients land should be removed.</p>		

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
Design Group	The DS Group will be replacing some photos due to duplication and updating maps to ensure compatibility with text	Noted	DSG amending DS
Senior Planning Officer – Daventry District Council	<p>The Senior Planning Officer has checked the views and important open spaces (IOS). The proposed deletion of IOS at Spring Close has been highlighted above (j on page 21).</p> <p>A series of additions and deletions to existing proposed views are needed. Deletions have been made where there are not significant views or they are not visible from public places.</p> <p>Page 20 Hollowell re-word a) to “Long open views are provided along Creaton Road towards the village and out of the village to the hilly north landscape and Highfield area across fields”.</p> <p>Remove c) as this cannot be justified as an Important Open Space – in addition, the views from Creaton Road across this site are not significant.</p> <p>Remove d) as this is not visible from a public place and cannot be justified as an IOS</p> <p>Page 21 g) the pasture fields cannot be justified as IOS – in addition many are not visible from public places.</p>	<p>Amend as proposed new plans</p> <p>Amend text as proposed</p> <p>Remove from VDS</p> <p>Remove from VDS</p> <p>Remove from VDS</p>	Amend DS as proposed

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>Page 22 Teeton – a) amend text to “Long distance panoramic views are provided across fields to the north-east, south-east and east”.</p> <p>b) amend text to : “The grounds of Teeton Hall provide an open setting to the settlement when viewed from the Spratton Road to the south-east. Meanwhile, the copse to the north bordering Creaton Road screens and shelters the settlement”.</p> <p>Page 23 Highfield a) amend text to: “The panoramic views across fields to the east, south and west over open countryside and the valley of the Stowe Brooke. The view to the south-west extends to Hollowell village”.</p> <p>b) move this to landscape section as more appropriate there.</p>	<p>Amend VDS</p> <p>Amend VDS</p> <p>Amend VDS</p> <p>Amend VDS by moving</p>	
<p><b>Long Buckby Village Design Statement</b></p>			
<p>Daventry District Council - Conservation</p>	<p>Is it possible to refer to Northamptonshire’s environmental character and green infrastructure suite or the extensive urban survey of Long Buckby carried out by NCC to inform description of character areas, issues and vulnerabilities.....?</p> <p>Reference to 1997 Local Plan – but what</p>	<p>Amend DS to require Developers to consider the Northamptonshire Environmental Character and Green Infrastructure Suite</p> <p>It is not necessary to highlight</p>	<p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>about current government targets for growth (e.g. MKSM)?</p> <p>Reference to photos throughout is unclear – but probably just because this is only a draft.</p> <p><b><u>Economic - Recommendations</u></b></p> <p>E1 - what is this trying to say? Any particular policies? Any special controls/considerations?</p> <p>E2 - How? (e.g. support existing businesses, encourage new ones? What types?</p> <p>E3 - How? What does attractive and accessible mean? Do you mean design, materials, size, scale, finish, location, etc...</p> <p>E4 - Also think about potential noise issues, pollution, scale of buildings in relation to domestic properties, etc.</p> <p>E6 – what does local amenity mean – any particular issues/concerns?</p>	<p>this in this document</p> <p>Confirm – photo referencing will be inserted following Adoption</p> <p>This guideline does not add any further detail to existing planning policy, however community wish to highlight this issue, therefore move it to Village Preferences</p> <p>The SPD covers design, not land use issues. No action required.</p> <p>No clarification required as this is a general guideline.</p> <p>Amend DS: “local residential properties. The proposed use, opening hours, parking, illuminated and other advertisements shall be designed to minimise their impact on residential properties”</p> <p>Local Amenity is a planning term, which requires no further</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>None</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>E8 – perhaps look at re-use of existing buildings (e.g. traditional farm buildings) and provide some guidelines for retaining character and setting of buildings, etc.</p> <p><b><u>Landscape – Recommendations</u></b></p> <p>L1 – Encourage use of traditional boundary treatments such as stone and brick walls, not just fences. This does not tie up with a statement in the main text later on under section 6....</p> <p>Look at important views into and out of the village – need to preserve and where appropriate enhance.</p> <p><b><u>Pattern of Settlement – Recommendations</u></b></p>	<p>clarification</p> <p>DG have chosen not to include this</p> <p>L1 refers to soft edges to village, therefore suggested change is not required</p> <p>Additional text to be added to Section 4 para.1 : “...gives rise to excellent views out of the village across the fields, but also conversely views of the settlement from beyond the village. In particular there are good views towards the church from the north and from Murcott in the east towards the village. Views are particularly evident from public rights of way, which allow easy access to the surrounding countryside. Map 2 highlights some of the key views”</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>Look at spacing between buildings, orientation, relationship to street frontage, etc.</p> <p><b><u>Buildings and Spaces – Recommendations</u></b></p> <p>B1 – are there any other important views to be retained? What about opportunities for enhancement?</p> <p>B2 – include variations in form, status, size and scale. Reference to materials are too specific and somewhat confusing. I would simply list the typical materials here and perhaps acknowledge that there are distinctive patterns of use, and architectural detailing appropriate to each. What about roof materials? What about preference for timber rather than plastic windows on traditional buildings? etc.</p>	<p>DG have not defined this therefore no action required</p> <p>Insert new text as per comment above</p> <p>Amend DB and re-order section B – B1, B3, B4 come first and B2 moves to become B4 with new text: “...details, including stone, brick and render. Brick and stone should be locally sourced, wherever possible and the colour and design matched to ensure sympathy with existing buildings. Render should be neutral in colour. Roof materials shall also be sympathetic to the immediate environment”.</p> <p>“Developers shall include typical Long Buckby features within their development, for example door surrounds and porches; dormer windows with pitched roofs; white painted timber sash windows; a white rendered dwelling as a focal point in the streetscene”.</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>Some repetition in B6?</p> <p>Also look at street furniture – e.g. telephone boxes, bins, lighting, etc. – retention of existing and sympathetic new furniture in terms of design, density and siting that respects the character of the village.</p> <p><b><u>Roads and Traffic</u></b></p> <p>No specific reference to the railway in the main text of this section. What about layout and design of station and relationship to main village in terms of setting and connectivity?</p>	<p>Insert a new B5: "Where new plastic windows are used, these should reflect the glazing proportions and styles of the windows that are replaced".</p> <p>Existing B5-7 to follow with re-numbering</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>DG have chosen not to cover this, therefore no action required</p> <p>Amend DS section 7 para.5: "...well served. An important aspect of Long Buckby and unique for a community of this size in Northamptonshire is the railway station, which provides services to London and Birmingham. Despite recent improvements, many of the facilities at the station are inadequate, for example poor ticket office, no toilets, no ramp or lift to platforms, poor parking</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>etc. The Station is therefore in need of improvement”.</p> <p>Insert new guideline “The current station facilities should be improved and carefully designed to ensure that it meets the needs of users, whilst also respecting the local environment”.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b>  R7 – look at minimising number of signs – removing those that become redundant to avoid clutter, etc. but retaining traditional signs of architectural or historic interest.  Look at retaining roadside verges and hedges?  Look at enhancing entrances to village on main roads?  Look at surfacing of roads and footpaths – appropriate to location.</p> <p>What about street furniture (e.g. lighting, bins, etc.) along roads and footpaths? - sympathetic design, location and density.</p> <p>I think the issues discussed in Village</p>	<p>etc. The Station is therefore in need of improvement”.</p> <p>Insert new guideline “The current station facilities should be improved and carefully designed to ensure that it meets the needs of users, whilst also respecting the local environment”.</p> <p>Amend to : “...permits, and where possible rationalised”</p> <p>Amend DS to insert further guidelines under section 7:  ”Roadside verges and hedges shall be retained and managed appropriately”  “Roads and footpath surfaces shall be sympathetically designed and appropriate to their location”  L8 already covers gateways – no action needed</p> <p>DG have chosen not to include these, therefore no action required</p> <p>Amend and edit DS as follows:</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>preferences section at the rear of the document are all relevant planning issues and relevant guidelines could be created to reflect this.</p>	<p>“1.....Church shall be enhanced.”  Point 2 should be moved to section 7 descriptive text.  Point 3 to move to section 7 descriptive text and a new guideline to be provided:  ”Design to reduce speed and improve pedestrian safety should be considered in High Street near the village centre”  Points 4 and 5 are land use, not design issues and hence should remain in “preferences”.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Howkins and Harrison</p>	<p>Para 5 mentions the unattractive approach to the village from the Wharf Road where the initial approach shows the railway station and the bridge. Despite mentioning this however, there is no recommendation. This point is also made in Village Preferences No. 2. We would propose an additional recommendation</p> <p>S6 - the unattractive gateway to the village around the railway station and its bridge should be improved visually to enhance its historic significance and the village gateway</p> <p>2) We would propose an additional recommendation to improve the unsatisfactory on-street parking and</p>	<p>Amend DS to include gateway improvements as highlighted previously above</p> <p>Amend DS to refer to station improvements as highlighted previously above</p> <p>This concern should be taken up by consultee with NCC Highways</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>None</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>congestion around The Banks</p> <p>R8 - the parking and congestion in The Banks could be helped by a one way system of traffic flow</p> <p>3) Section 3 concerning economic and other pressures does not mention the past growth and provision of sports facilities which are exceptional for a village the size of Long Buckby and the section should do so</p> <p>Recommended inclusion: E9 - the Statement should recognise maintain and enhance the facilities Long Buckby enjoys with the exceptional provision of sports facilities.</p> <p>4) Similarly, the Statement should mention the importance of the railway station and rail services to Long Buckby. The canal system receives a mention under this section in recommendation E8 and there should therefore be an additional recommendation as follows: E10 - the Statement should recognise and enhance the importance of the railway station and its rail services.</p> <p>5) The Statement should recognise the importance of green issues and the opportunities for the provision of energy</p>	<p>This concern should be taken up by consultee with NCC Highways</p> <p>Sport facilities at Long Buckby are no more than for other villages of this size – amendment is not required</p> <p>The DS is about design not land use issues – no change needed</p> <p>A new guideline highlighting the station design is to be included as highlighted previously above – rail services are not relevant to a DS</p> <p>DS refers to sustainability generally -DG have chosen not to include further detail -no</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>None</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>through biomass and other renewable resources.</p> <p>There should be an additional para. E11: E11 - the Statement should recognise and encourage the importance of the provision of biomass and other renewable energy resources. Enhancements of the environment and provision of ecologically viable homes should be encouraged.</p>	<p>action required</p> <p>Amend DS to incorporate a general sustainability design guideline under section 6: "New development is encouraged which incorporates and promotes sustainable layout and design"</p>	<p>Amend DS</p>
<p>British Waterways</p>	<p>Example of better links is found in the Long Buckby village draft, policy R3 dealing with transport which states that walkways and cycleways will be encouraged between Long Buckby and Buckby wharf. We warmly support such policies.</p>	<p>Comment welcomed</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Mr Lock, resident of Long Buckby</p>	<p>It was a pleasure to see this positive and desperately needed initiative. Fully agree with the main points of the DS. As a Landscape Architect living in Long Buckby (only 2 years) I have often thought if there was a general design statement or village design appraisal or design guide or any document to guide the long term development/expansion of Long Buckby or even the improvement of Long Buckby character. And here it is. May I say that it was desperately needed with all the Central Government proposed developments and changes in the law as well as the needed</p>	<p>Comments welcomed</p>	<p>None</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>expansion of the housing market.</p> <p>I miss a statement that Long Buckby wants to strive to become a more sustainable village where the use of public transport (readily available), alternative energy, Zero Carbon Housing developments, inclusive public realms and reduction of car use is to be promoted without losing its thriving economic power/hub....</p> <p>Missing the Cyclist..... Long Buckby has actually a huge diversity of cyclists from young to old but they are not catered for at all at the moment.</p> <p>Missing a statement on the station and the connection with Long Buckby. The station in Long Buckby is an asset, which will be missed if it would disappear. However the path to the station is dark and lonely which will put a lot of people off using the facility and only stimulate the use of the car to get to. Increasing its use will be detrimental for keeping the station. Without the station Long Buckby will be a lot less attractive for people to stay and buy in the future.</p> <p>You mention at point three public open spaces, views and new developments which need public space. These are in my view three different issues. The existing public space (which I would mainly classify as: The REC, Mill Park, Church yards, Market square and the Castle) The views</p>	<p>Amend DS to include new sustainable design guideline as indicated previously above</p> <p>Cycling is mentioned in the DS</p> <p>Amend DS as highlighted previously above to include the station design</p> <p>Policy RC2 of the Local Plan protects existing open spaces from development. The Castle is also a Scheduled Ancient Monument. Amend DS L3 to include enhancement i.e text change to read ...."must be</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>None</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>within Long Buckby (according to the map it shows the views out of Long Buckby but not within) and new developments and public space. The Green - My questions arising from this is why should an ugly not functional public space (the REC park) or an underutilised space (The Castle) be protected? Are the Views within Long Buckby worth to be kept and are they used? will developments not create new as liked views? does any small development need to secure public space. What does public space include, etc.</p> <p>With point 5 I fully agree and the new proposed Youth Centre its prison fence will be the first one to be put on the agenda in such case.</p>	<p>change to read ....“must be preserved and enhanced”...            DG have not identified any views within the village therefore no change required. Local Plan Policy RC1 specifies open space requirements for new developments.</p> <p>Point noted</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Design Group</p> <p>See Appendix C for general comments made at Design Group Public Exhibition</p> <p>In addition, see Appendix D for text changes proposed by Design Group and Council decision</p>			

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
Senior Planning Officer	<p>Comments in addition to those made by the Senior Planning Officer highlighted above.</p> <p>Page numbering shall be included to assist referencing</p> <p>L9 Amend text to clarify/strengthen guideline: “New development....created by developers...”</p> <p>S2 Amend text to strengthen: “In the rest....reasons otherwise. Developers shall state these reasons within their Design Statement, to accompany their Planning Application. Exceptions might include....ecological merit”</p> <p>S4 could be rephrased slightly: “Murcott must retain its historical identity as a very small agricultural community set in a detached location from the main village and located alongside the B5385”.</p>	Amend as proposed	Amend DS

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
<b>Naseby Village Design Statement</b>			
Daventry District Council - Conservation	<p>Page 12 - Para 2 – missing “century” currently reads “18<sup>th</sup> Georgian”</p> <p>Photo - “Example of Victorian fascia board and dormer window” – this is an eaves window not a dormer as it bisects the eaves rather than sitting completely in the roof slope. Could a better example picture be used with an original window rather than a poor replacement?</p> <p>Page 14 - Photo – could a better picture be used as the chimney is in shadow and much of the fine detailing is not visible? It is also unfortunate that there is an television aerial attached to it!</p> <p>Windows – This is a bad description of the detailing as a professional who would use this document this is confusing and not entirely clear. What do you mean by 2 or 3 course blue or yellow brick? A course of brickwork refers to one layer of bricks, on looking at the window details I am unsure what “course” refers to in this instance.</p> <p>Page 15 - Para 2 – With timber windows there will always be an amount of maintenance in terms of repainting which does not exist with PVCu windows so it</p>	<p>Amend DS to include</p> <p>Amend DS to replace photo</p> <p>Amend DS to replace photo</p> <p>Amend DS to clarify this or exemplify via photo</p> <p>Amend DS to remove “...However...those of pvc” and state instead “...avoided in future. Where</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>would be unreasonable to ask for the specification of timber to match PVCu. However PVCu windows should be resisted as they are a modern alien feature.</p> <p>Para 3 – confusing wording. It would be better to refer to historic buildings rather than “character buildings” as this is rather a vague term. As before dormer windows sit actually in the roof slope the windows described are eaves windows.</p> <p>Photo – This is not an example of rebated traditional windows it is (possibly) rebated windows on a modern property. The recessing is unclear and the photo should be labelled as a modern building.</p> <p>Guidelines – 2. Omit bay window as I don’t think this is what is being referred to. 3. Doorways also need to respect the proportions of the building they are in.</p> <p>Page 16 - Guidelines 2. Boundary treatments should be either walls or green boundaries, as this appears to be the predominant boundary treatment in the village. The picket style fencing mentioned appears to be a relatively</p>	<p>traditional wooden design/materials are used, these should be of high design quality and have high U values” – also include a footnote that U values are an insulation measurement</p> <p>Amend DS to include this wording and clarify reference to Dormer Windows.</p> <p>Amend DS to clarify text for photos on page 15</p> <p>Amend DS to remove reference to “bay” and include new text for point 3</p> <p>Amend DS to incorporate these points</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>modern introduction, which is more suburban in nature and should be discouraged. On the edges of the village a post and rail type fence may be more appropriate.</p> <p>Page 19 – Guidelines 4. Please can this be changed to “All external lighting, particularly security equipment is designed to minimise light pollution”, as altering lighting is a common thing on existing houses and can change the ambience of the street scene unnecessarily.</p> <p>Page 21 – Photo 1 – Incorrectly labelled it is a rebated casement window.</p> <p>Photo 3 – Incorrectly labelled this is an eaves window, the casements are modern and it is difficult to see the rebating referred to.</p> <p>Photo 4 – please could a photo be used with an original or traditional window in to try and illustrate good practice rather than the PVCu window shown.</p> <p>Photo 8. – It may also be worth noting that this is an interesting local 19<sup>th</sup> century plinth detail.</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
British Waterways	<p>We would very much like to see signage, either brown or fingerpost, from the settlement to the canal system and the development of circular walks from suitable settlements to the canal towpaths or reservoirs used for recreation and leisure.</p>	<p>Amend DS page 20 to include new guideline:  “Appropriate signage shall be provided to Naseby Reservoir”.</p> <p>The issue of circular walks is not a design issue</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>None</p>
Berrys on behalf of landowner	<p>On map 1 of the Design Statement the client’s area is proposed to be designated as an important open space (C2).</p> <p>We are instructed by the owner of the land to appeal against this designation as the field has, in the past, been identified as a potential development site and we believe that the designation for that use should be preserved. The field abuts existing development on its west and southern boundaries and has a road frontage, which is immediately opposite the Village Hall which has been considerably developed in the past. In view of the fact that the site has a boundary to the road to the north and development on two sides it would seem to be a logical area to be designated for development.</p>	<p>The Senior Planning Officer confirms that there is no development designation attached to this site. The site is a pasture field directly adjacent to the village. When viewed from the public right of way, which borders the field to one side and runs north to south-east from Haselbech Road, this field provides a good view towards the church spire (see photo A). The SPO proposes that although the site cannot be justified as an Important Open Space in its own right, the significance of the view across this open field area is important to the character of the village and therefore the site should be defined as an Important Undeveloped Space.</p>	<p>Amend DS</p>
Senior Planning Officer	<p>Page 7 point 1 remove “distant”.</p>	<p>Amend DS</p>	<p>Amend DS as per all of these points</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>Page 7 reference to Special Panoramic Landscape Areas defined by the DG may be confused with current Special Landscape Area designation, therefore propose that this be amended. Map 4 page 31 also indicates that the whole parish is covered by this designation and the referencing on this map to A1-A10 is unclear and requires clarifying in text.</p> <p>Page 7 point 3 needs to be clarified in design terms.</p> <p>Page 7 point 8 reiterates point 7.</p> <p>Page 8 point 14 final sentence is unnecessary so should be removed, as this procedure will happen as a matter of course.</p> <p>Page 8 point 14 as no evidence is cited clarify that this is the opinion of the community.</p>	<p>Amend DS page7 point 1.          "It...upon (see Map 2....page 31 and 32) The reference to "The distant views..." Is descriptive and should be moved to the descriptive text. The whole Parish has been defined by the DG as Special therefore this should be clearly highlighted in terms of important views not landscape area. Page 31-32 map needs clarifying re- what area referencing is referring to, as lettering A1 etc it is not cross-referenced anywhere to explain what A1, A2 etc are.</p> <p>Amend DS: "...rigorous design consideration"</p> <p>Remove Point 8</p> <p>Remove last sentence as stated</p> <p>Amend DS: "...air pollution in the opinion of the community....."</p>	

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>Page 8 point 1 maps page 31-32 need to clearly identify/state on them that the Landscape Areas identified are part of the Parish Preferences section – not Guidelines</p> <p>In addition, for clarity it would be easier if the photos surrounding Map 4 were cross-referenced on the map to indicate where the photo is taken from.</p> <p>Page 9 point 1 needs to relate to design, rather than land-use issues.</p> <p>Page 9 point 2 is a land use rather than design issue and needs to move to preferences section</p> <p>Page 11 point 2 repeats to some extent page 7 point 7</p> <p>Page 12 Map 1 needs to identify market cross and war memorial</p> <p>The Senior Planning Officer has checked important views and important open spaces and revisions will be made to the map.</p>	<p>Amend Map 4 to include text to highlight these are Parish Preferences and cross reference to Page 8 – however also clearly indicate that the views are part of the guidelines</p> <p>Provide cross-referenced coding on Map 4.</p> <p>Amend DS “...provision of well designed additional...”</p> <p>Amend DS and move to Preferences</p> <p>Amend DS to merge point 2 with point 7 and delete reference to views guideline on page 11</p> <p>Amend Map 1</p> <p>Some views have been inserted and some have been removed as they do not provide significant views or are not visible from public places.</p>	

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
		<p>As highlighted above it is proposed that :</p> <p>C2 be redefined as Important Undeveloped Space.</p> <p>C3 cannot currently be defined as Important Open Space, however the site is bounded to the south by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) Area containing ash, horse chestnut, hawthorne and sycamore, and 2 small TPO groups of ash trees to the east boundary. In addition, there is a TPO Ash tree within the site and 4 further TPO trees in private gardens bounding the site (off High Street). The Village intend to research further this site and may in due course propose an amendment to the adopted VDS should new relevant information become forthcoming. It is proposed that C3 shall be removed as an Important Open Space, but be redefined on the plan with new colour coding and referred to in the text as a "Parish Preference" and sub-heading/noted as "retain as tree pasture" with the text description re- the TPOs as</p>	

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
		<p>highlighted above.</p> <p>C5, a pasture field, to be removed as it cannot be defined as Important Open Space.</p> <p>C6 Additional text to describe this site to be inserted as follows:</p> <p>“C6 - Historic site of ancient Nutcote Settlement -There is archeological evidence, supported by more recent aerial photographs, that Naseby village encompassed several fields adjacent to Nutcote and Church Street. These ancient 11<sup>th</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup> century settlements comprised of earthworks, a natural spring, fish ponds, and Middle Age dwellings. In 1349 the Black Death took its toll on the village and the population was diminished with some areas being abandoned. On the 1630 Naseby map ‘Bunches Close’ was the name of the field behind Nutcote running down to what is now the Cold Ashby road. The main settlement in this area was called ‘The Starmer’ with other individual dwellings scattered</p>	

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
		further back in the fields. The ancient Nutcote settlement is therefore of special historic importance to the village".	
<b>Norton Village Design Statement</b>			
Croudace	We maintain that the stipulation set out on page 13, which calls for "a 1km (0.58 mile) buffer zone between the Village and any new developments" is an arbitrary dimension in the context of preserving the identity of the village, and should therefore be deleted.	Amend DS - This is a land use, rather than a design issue and therefore is not appropriate to the VDS, but can be placed in a separate section of "Village Preferences"	Amend DS
Turley Associates for Danetree Village	Sensitive development in the surrounding countryside will not affect Norton village and consequently certain statements need to be qualified. Pg 13 <i>"All development or extensions to existing properties should not adversely affect views, nor the proximity to the countryside that all parts of the village currently enjoy"</i> . This is an overly simplistic statement without taking into account the circumstances of each site and may preclude development, which has been identified as being necessary in order to meet housing delivery objectives. New development should be designed in order to minimise its overall impact within the	Amend DS to be more specific about which views are being referred to i.e those in the Appendices. The village is small enough in layout terms to be very close to countryside around it and therefore it is not unreasonable for the DG to make this design point.	Amend DS

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>local area. This can be done through a landscape strategy and a context led masterplan, which has considered views into and out of the site. Sensitive development should not adversely affect Norton.</p> <p>Pg 13 notes that <i>“as a restricted Infill Village is it recommended that Norton should not be extended further into open countryside”</i>. The document explains that if development occurs, there should be a buffer zone between Norton and the development of 1 km.</p> <p>We do not think that a 1 km buffer zone is necessary to protect Norton from development. A buffer zone of 1 km would take up a large amount of land, therefore significantly reducing the amount of land available for development; this is both unreasonable, unnecessary and an arbitrary conclusion. This could have further implications of higher density development being required to meet the DDC’s housing target if not enough land was available.</p> <p>We agree that it is not appropriate or desirable to have piecemeal development which is both unsuitable and unsustainable and instead support the principle of large scale strategic development which would be</p>	<p>Amend DS - This is a land use, rather than a design issue and therefore reference to a buffer is not appropriate to the VDS, but may be placed in a separate section of “Village Preferences”.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>None</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>accommodated away from Norton and not have any adverse effects on it through landscape buffers and a context led masterplan.</p> <p>The document recognises that Norton lacks areas of open space and relies upon the surrounding fields, especially the footpaths for recreational use. The Parish Council is currently looking to obtain land for a community area. The slopes of Borough Hill are within DVC's control and this land could provide further open space facilities for the local residents. The buffer zone will therefore provide immediate adjacent open space.</p> <p>Pg 20 highlights that <i>"on site parking provision is a must for all new dwellings, even if it means that the overall footprint of the dwelling is reduced in size"</i>. This is too prescriptive and national policy prefers that the amount of car parking provided should be the minimum requirements where possible, in order to encourage the use of public transport.</p> <p>Pg20 <i>"Consideration should be given for thatching a roof instead of roof tiles"</i>. Whilst this may be appropriate in areas of existing development, it is not necessary, appropriate or cost effective in new developments. It should be</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Amend DS to state instead that: "Parking shall be provided on site and developers shall refer to the SPD Parking for parking standards".</p> <p>This does not state that it is "required" only "consideration..given", hence no amendment is necessary.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>None</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>recognised that there are many equally attractive roof forms and coverings that might be employed. It is attention to detail and quality of materials that is significant.</p> <p>Pg23 <i>“The village would encourage re-routing of the traffic along the Long Buckby Road with appropriate signage. A change of priorities by the golf course would be an improvement on the volume of traffic using the village. Making Norton ‘access only’ from Daventry and the A5 would have the desired effect of reducing the flow of traffic and would increase the quality of life within the village itself”.</i>            We do not agree this is appropriate or necessary to make Norton ‘access only’ - would be operationally very difficult. It is not a deliverable solution and this reference should be deleted unless practical evidence can be provided. There are other more achievable methods to reduce traffic.</p> <p>Pg23 <i>“It is suggested that a chicane system be put in place so that traffic leaving the village has the right of way at both ends of the village”.</i>            Again, this would be operationally very difficult and unrealistic to come forward.</p> <p>Pg 26 <i>“Buildings should be either of brick</i></p>	<p>Again this only states they would “encourage” this as a village – it is therefore not a “requirement”, hence no amendment is necessary.</p> <p>Again this is a “suggestion” not a “requirement”, hence no amendment is necessary.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p><i>or stone. Stone when used should be Northants Sand and Ironstone and should not be artificial. Brick should be muted red or buff facing bricks, (brown lial) similar to those used throughout the village, especially in those dwellings which were built in the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century”.</i></p> <p>Whilst we agree that it will be appropriate for many new buildings to conform to these materials, it is sensible to allow for flexibility that would enable a development that chooses to use more sustainable and suitable materials.</p>	<p>Amend DS to be more flexible and promote high quality, sustainable, innovative designs and materials, which take reference from the design features identified in the DS.</p>	
<p>Senior Planning Officer – Daventry District Council</p>	<p>Page 13 further to comments made on this text highlighted above - The reader may misread the inset text as a statement quoted from the Local Plan which it is not – subject to comments above, this needs re-wording to clarify that the inset text is the text of the Design Group.</p> <p>Page 14 – Purchasing of allotments is a Parish Preference, not a design guide and hence shall be contained under a separate new sub-heading of “Parish Preference”</p> <p>Page 19 – final point – identify page number/plan on which key viewpoints can be cross-referenced to</p> <p>Page 26 – Title “Additional Guidelines”</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	needs to correspond to the Contents page "Guideline Summary" and a brief introduction sentence added to highlight what this section is for clarity – this section needs reviewing to ensure that it takes on board amendments proposed above, plus it needs to remove additional "Parish Preferences" that have been placed in this section – these need to be put in a distinct section e.g reference to backfill page 27 etc		
<b>Scaldwell Village Design Statement</b>			
Daventry District Council - Conservation	<p>Page 5 – Line 10 – over complicated sentence, confused use of the word mitigate. Would be better if it read "any projected change in the village should still be considered on its own merits, and on the effect on the spaces and buildings around it"</p> <p>Settlement patterns and open space guidelines - 8. Do you mean that the landscaping should conform to the architectural style of the building? At the moment it reads like it should be in building guidelines.</p> <p>Boundary walls, gardens and trees guidelines 1. "Any new walls shall be constructed from</p>	<p>Amend DS as suggested</p> <p>This guideline concerns the building rather than important open space, therefore should be removed from this section</p> <p>It is not enforceable to require that only "local stone" can be used, therefore while desirable,</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>None</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>local stone or stone that will blend in with the old walls” would be better to only state “local stone” as these will retain the vernacular. There is an argument that the right type and colouring of artificial stone “will blend with the old walls around the centre of the village” it’s always good to be more specific.</p> <p>2. New brick should match in terms finish and size as well as colour. The mortar treatment should also match local historic mortar treatment. A traditional brick bond should also be used.</p> <p>6. This should read “Applications for Tree Preservation Orders shall be made on identified special trees. New developments should take account of existing trees, which shall be incorporated into their design.”</p> <p>Scaldwell buildings General - Scaldwell is characterised by its stone buildings, it is one of the most complete stone villages in the district – more should be made of this!</p> <p>Page 13 - Line 15 – “this is a very perpendicular one up one down dwelling” perpendicular is a very definite architectural style. Is this what you mean? Or do you</p>	<p>this cannot be stated.</p> <p>Amend DS to highlight this</p> <p>Recommend new text to clarify this comment as follows: “Identified special trees (see map on p xx) should be referred to the Council for consideration for designation of Tree Preservation Orders”</p> <p>Amend DS page 12 section 4. : “...old slate roofs and Scaldwell is one of the most complete stone villages in Daventry District. There are no terraces....”</p> <p>Amend DS to “upright”</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>mean upright?</p> <p>Building guidelines 2. Can this guideline be tightened up? It would be better if it read “Wherever possible walls and historic buildings of architectural merit should be preserved or renovated in a sympathetic manner”.</p> <p>Page 18 - Line 27 rather than elevations do you mean kerbs?</p>	<p>Amend DS incorporating this text</p> <p>Amend DS to state “kerbs”</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>
<p>EMW Law for Adam and Jane Bates, landowners in Scaldwell</p>	<p>Page 6 of the document in the paragraph headed "Back Lane, Peters Green and the Patch" has a number of inaccuracies and statements in it that cannot be borne out by the facts.</p> <p>1st sentence of the para. is entirely surmised and there is no empirical evidence to support this. It is correct that a restrictive covenant was imposed in a 1982 conveyance and this was for the benefit of the vendor's retained property described as the Old Post Office, also known as The Stores. Therefore, the vendor at that time had not looked to present or transfer this area of land to the village to be used as an open space, nor were any steps taken at that time or since to open up that space for use by the public nor will that be done. There is no evidence to support any other interpretation other</p>	<p>The Senior Planning Officer (SPO) confirms that VDS should identify characteristics that form the settlement, which includes identifying important open spaces (be they publicly or privately owned). The site has been assessed by the SPO who confirms that it forms important open space within the village.</p> <p>The DG have discussed this issue since the Consultation response deadline with the respondent and the following text has been agreed by them both:</p> <p>Insert new text under Important Open Spaces <b>“Back Lane,</b></p>	<p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>than that the covenant was imposed purely for the personal benefit of the vendor's retained land rather than to benefit the villagers in any general way and it is not even certain that the intention was to prevent development. The intention may have merely been to be able to ransom any future owner that wished to carry out development so as to have to buy out the covenant.</p> <p>The Patch has never been accessible to the public and there is no empirical evidence to support that it ever has been. It is private land to which the public has no right of access.</p> <p>It is therefore incorrect to state that this part of the village is of "an accessible nature" in relation to the Patch as it has never been accessible to the public. The area in general is accessible because Back Lane is a public footpath through which any member of the public can walk.</p> <p>Although our client has no immediate intentions to do anything else with the Patch other than to keep it as green space, and their primary purpose on purchasing the land was to enjoy it as additional private land for the benefit of the adjoining property, The Bramley ultimately any future use of the Patch is</p>	<p><b>Peter's Green and the Patch</b></p> <p>When the grounds around the Grange were developed in the 1970s, the owner intended The Patch or Paddock to enhance the buildings around it and to provide an open area for the benefit of the village. He placed covenants on the Patch, which have preserved it until today. Its importance was emphasised in the DDC Conservation Report of 1997. The tranquil atmosphere and accessible nature of this part of the village is valued by villagers, and the unadopted road through Back Lane is continually used by pedestrians. There is a footpath joining Back Lane and Peter's Lane. The Patch's open green space should be preserved. It has a magnificent sycamore and a fringe of fruit trees at the northern end. The adjacent garden of 'Peter's Green' includes unusual and mature non-native trees including a Dawn Redwood, a Brewer's Spruce and a Paperbark Birch, which contribute to the open character of the area".</p>	

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>a matter for the owner and the local planning authority.</p> <p>At para.3 page 7 Settlement Patterns and Open Spaces Guidelines it states that this is "our second village green". There is no evidence to support this. The patch is not registered as a village green, nor is there any listing of any intention or application to seek to register it as such. There is no history of the land being used for public amenity purposes whatsoever and it has been and remains private open space for the enjoyment of the owner.</p> <p>It is wrong to state this should be preserved as an open space. This should at least be qualified by the words "private open space" otherwise it could be seen to imply that the public have a right of access to it for amenity purposes which has not, is not and will not be the case as it is privately owned land.</p> <p>We also note, having reviewed the Conservation Area Appraisal and Design Document that there are similar unsubstantiated statements and factual inconsistencies. For example, at page 24 it refers to the property having a "gardenesque character" and it being unclear whether you are on public or</p>	<p>Reference to it as a second village green has been removed (see comments further below).</p>	

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>private property. It would appear like a garden because it is privately owned. The same paragraph refers to the area being maintained by one of the adjacent properties - no doubt by the adjacent property that owned the land at the time. It makes an unsubstantiated statement about it being publicly accessible - most private gardens and land do not ultimately prevent access by the public but this is still private land over which the public do not exercise public amenity rights.</p> <p>Therefore the relevant paragraphs will need to be amended to reflect the above in the final adopted version of the statement. The Village Design Statement should concentrate upon identifying the features which contribute to the unique character of the village, not seek to impose a "wish list" regarding the future use of any privately owned land.</p>		
Jonathan Harris, resident of Scaldwell	<p>I object to page 14 11. phrase 'the village feels ..' as villagers have never been consulted on such an issue; please could you simply remove the words 'the village feels that'. I, for one, would support wind turbines if seen to be an affective form of power generation.</p> <p>References to the Playing Field -</p>	<p>See comments made further below</p> <p>Amend DS to update situation</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>Daventry DC Full Council approved the transfer of ownership of the playing field to Scaldwell Parish Council on 6th December 2007. Although this transfer may not legally be complete by the time the VDS document is published you may wish to remove references to such things as a potential '99 year lease' as this is now no longer the case.</p> <p>Overall I think the VDS is a very thorough and well produced document.</p>	<p>as at time of Adoption</p> <p>Comment welcomed</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Dylan and Jenny Lewis, residents of Scaldwell</p>	<p>We purchased Peters Green, Scaldwell after the statement had been submitted by the parish council.</p> <p>These comments surround the description of Peters Green and the surrounding area, which we felt it was important to describe carefully. We believe that the important characteristics which we would like to see preserved are the relationship between the building and the (planted) landscape, and the extensive and varied non-native planting.</p> <p>We would also like to strongly support the comments made in the statement surrounding "The Patch" which we would like to see continue in its present form as an open space.</p>	<p>Comment noted – amend DS to strengthen reference to relationship between built and natural environment – see text recommendation made previously above</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>None</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	We would also support inclusion of the first paragraph of the section "Building Guidelines" which recognises the diversity of styles and materials that have been used throughout the village.	Comment noted	None
Scaldwell Parish Council	Scaldwell Parish Council supports the draft VDS that has been created by our villagers. The team who created it have worked very hard and the Council feel they have produced an excellent document.	Comments welcomed	None
Scaldwell DG	<p>PAGE 8 Settlement Patterns &amp; Open Spaces Guidelines. Suggest amend opening para. to:</p> <p>"Scaldwell has several attractive open spaces throughout the village, each with its own special character. Any change should only be made after very careful consideration. The following are the most important as they can be appreciated from the roads and they should be treated with particular care"</p> <p>Insert 3 new lines under the related guidelines to emphasise the difference between public (the Green etc) and privately owned spaces (the Patch and those gardens):</p> <p>" The above are public open spaces; the following are privately owned, but can be seen and appreciated from the public areas".</p>	<p>Advise retain the existing text, rather than making this amendment – the open spaces are importance in themselves, change implies they are only important because of visibility from roads.</p> <p>Amend DS as proposed</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>Point 3 – Wish to change text to insert “...in any way, as this would...”</p> <p>5. The Patch rewrite to remove the reference to it as ...'second village Green', which is now inappropriate.</p> <p>MAP prepared showing open spaces, views, listed buildings and conservation area.</p> <p>PAGE 14 Buildings Guidelines Para 11 suggest new text to take account of the points on power generation raised by Jonathan Harris above :  ” Although the use of innovative power generation technologies is to be encouraged, some villagers feel that wind turbines are unlikely to be acceptable if visible from a public space, while others might support this technology. Solar panels would be acceptable if they were not clearly visible from the roads”.</p> <p>Page 8 Guidelines -added The Playing Field as a public open space. “The</p>	<p>Do not make amendment, as this conveys a land use, rather than a design guideline, which is not appropriate to a VDS</p> <p>Amend DS as proposed</p> <p>Amend DS to insert map</p> <p>Location of turbines is a land use rather than design issue, therefore this statement is only appropriate to a separate “Parish Preference” section. However, DG may incorporate new text taking on board design issues as follows to make into design guideline:  “Where wind turbines or solar panels are proposed, these shall be sympathetically designed to reduce their impact on the landscape or building character”.</p> <p>Amend DS as proposed</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>Playing Field - This large green space stretches from the south of East End towards Holcot Lane, and comprises football and cricket pitches and a playground area”.</p> <p>Set of photos proposed</p>	<p>All photos fine for inclusion, however delete text sentence under Highways guidelines starting “Unusually....Farm” as this is unnecessary.</p>	<p>Amend DS</p>
<p>Senior Planning Officer</p>	<p>Page 7 Insert new text at start of 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence : ”These shall be retained and any changes should only....</p> <p>Point 3 The Patch – remove “...which should not be built on”</p> <p>Page 8 Point 5. The Parks – remove “it is hoped that ...area..” The final sentence of this point is unnecessary and can be deleted.</p> <p>Point 10 Remove “This “classical” house...unaltered”....”Any modification...style”</p>	<p>Amend as proposed text</p> <p>Amend as proposed – the VDS should cover design, not determine land use</p> <p>This introduction is a Parish Preference and so should be highlighted in a separate Parish Preference section or removed, as it covers land use not design.</p> <p>This text relates to the building not to the open space and is therefore inappropriate. The title should read The Grange</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>Page 10 Point 3 insert "...Scaldwell is perceived by the village to be...Brixworth. Any future development ...sensitively landscaped to retain the character of Scaldwell..."</p> <p>"The Highways Authority..." section should be moved to the later Highways background text section</p> <p>Page 12 Point 5 text change "... case-by-case basis and agreed with the Parish Council"</p> <p>Point 6 Trees Amend text to "Identified special trees should be considered for Tree Preservation Order status..."</p> <p>Page 13 point 4 "...walls, which are integral to it."</p> <p>Page 14 point 6 remove "in future" from last sentence.</p> <p>Point 7 "...the Green. This characteristic shall be retained".</p>	<p>Gardens.</p> <p>Amendments proposed put this concern back in to the context of design</p> <p>Proposed text move to relevant chapter section.</p> <p>The current text implies that the Parish Council will deal with/provide all kerbs, therefore propose amendment.</p> <p>Amend to highlight this should be considered</p> <p>Propose change to strengthen phrase</p> <p>Remove as unnecessary text</p> <p>Insert new final sentence as proposed and remove existing last 3 sentences, which are land use, not design issues.</p>	<p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>Point 8 new text: " The village is concerned that should any future development extend beyond the southern....If either site were developed the design should maintain the existing..."</p> <p>Page 17 Point 3 "...The Parish and District Councils require these groups to consult them at pre-application stage on any proposals being made, which might affect those amenities and would also encourage consultation should the proposed changes not require permission.</p> <p>Page 20 point 2 remove term "regulation"</p>	<p>Amendments proposed to highlight design, rather than land use issues.</p> <p>Amendment to clarify when consultation is required</p> <p>Remove as this is not a "regulation"</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>
<p><b>Sibbertoft Village Design Statement</b></p>			
<p>Daventry District Council - Conservation</p>	<p>Page 12 - Line 10 – "older houses are local orange-red brick and in the older properties the use of vitrified dark blue headers give distinctive patterning" – can a date be used rather than the terms "older houses and older properties" as this is a bit vague. They appear to date from the late nineteenth century.</p> <p>Line 14 – "Modern Buildings" again this is a bit vague can some kind of dating be added i.e. twentieth century buildings, buildings</p>	<p>Amend DS to highlight late 19<sup>th</sup> century</p> <p>Amend DS to highlight 20<sup>th</sup> century buildings</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>built after 1950?</p> <p>Line 17 – “Red brown clay tiles” – if these are historic handmade clay tiles then they are a valid traditional form of roofing although not prevalent in this area they are part of the local building tradition. Does this refer to the mass produced clay or concrete tile? If so this distinction needs to be made clear.</p> <p>Page 13 - Line 34 – “Fences” should be made more explicit i.e. post and rail fences. Close-boarded suburban fences are not suitable for rural village locations such as Sibbertoft.</p> <p><b><u>General</u></b>  Specific mention should be made of the historic boundary treatments around Sibbertoft in the main body of the design statement, rather than just as an annex, as this is what gives the village much of its character. Also as it is referred to in the building guidelines.</p> <p>Number the guidelines, as this allows for easy reference; especially in reports i.e. planning committee reports can refer to building guideline 3.</p>	<p>Amend DS to clarify this point</p> <p>Amend DS to clarify that as per Annexure C fences refers to caste iron palings</p> <p>There is no requirement to include all details in the main text, however the main text should be amended to include:  “Boundary walls and fences are important features in Sibbertoft and a full description of them is provided in Annexure C”</p> <p>Amend DS to make this change</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
<p>Celia Lewis, Landowner in Sibbertoft</p>	<p><b>Springcroft (IOS2 on the Map)</b> Object to the marking of land as 'Important Open Space'..... This goes against planning law (under which there is no right to a view) and pre-empts the forthcoming review of the DDC local plan and boundary work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The land in question (marked IOS2 on Annexure A) is not 2 acres but about an acre.</li> <li>- Some of the area marked IOS2 has planning permission for two linked dwellings (DA/2007/0086) which are currently being built.</li> <li>- This land.... is Private land, with no public access, and has no role in 'life of village'. It is therefore unlike any of the other areas marked as 'Important Open Space', but the same as contiguous land to the north of my site (rear of Ladybower/Meadow Lodge on Berkeley Street) which also has views marked across it. However, the land to the North is not down as 'Important Open Space' and my land should be treated the same way.</li> <li>- Any view across site is from mainly private property only. The view into the</li> </ul>	<p>Confirm people have no right to a view in planning law, however DS can identify views from <u>public</u> places and also areas that the community appraise to be important open spaces i.e areas that are considered intrinsic to the form, setting and character of a settlement and visible to the public.</p> <p>Checked and confirmed. Amend DS to "about 1 acre".</p> <p>DG to check boundary and amend as necessary</p> <p>Important open spaces or views can be respectively on/across private or public land. The Senior Planning Officer has checked this site and confirms that views are private ones across the site from north to south and therefore arrows need to be removed from this direction. Note: The DG have since consultation already checked this themselves and removed the important view arrows</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Check and amend DS as necessary</p> <p>None</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>site from the public road (Church street) is screened by avenue of mature Ash trees.</p> <p>- No views across my land are of any historic building like the Church or significant village feature. They are instead from rear and front gardens of adjacent ex-LA houses on Church Street, the adjacent house called Spring Croft and two new properties being built on part of area marked as IOS2 under planning permission DA/2007/0086.</p> <p>The main basis for marking of the land as 'Important Open Space' in the VDS stems from the 3 views marked across it on the VDS Plan Annexure A. Two of these views are from the rear of private houses on Berkeley Street. There is no 'right to a view' in planning law and it should be understood that these views are not from the public space of Berkeley Street but from private residences only and in fact the view is obscured by hedges and trees (with TPO) on the northern boundary of my land and mature Ash trees on the southern boundary with Church Street. These screening hedges and trees are all marked on Annexure B of Important Trees &amp; Hedges. I note that there are similar views marked over the land adjacent to mine to the North (to the rear of Ladybower and Meadow</p>	<p>across the site.</p> <p>Re- being an important open space - The site is bounded on Naseby Road by some hedging containing a few mature trees within it, however the site is not hidden and there are views in to the site. The field is clearly closely related to the village in layout terms and forms an important soft edge character to the built form of the village. Its character, form and setting is therefore considered to form an important open space.</p>	

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>Lodge) and, despite being contiguous and similar, this land has not been marked as 'Important Open Space'. It is inconsistent that my land has not been treated the same way.</p> <p>The third important view marked is looking towards Sibbertoft as approaching along the Naseby Road. Photo submitted by resposdee illustrates ...line of mature Ash trees forming the boundary of my land with Church Street. My land and the rear gardens of properties on Berkeley Street are screened by these trees. There are glimpses of my land if you get closer to the Ash trees but again what you see is the unremarkable site of the back gardens or neighbouring properties and the new houses being built under planning consent DA/2007/0086. What you don't see is important views of the overall village form, the Church or such like, which ....would be necessary to elevate the view to a status that could carry weight in planning law / SPG.</p> <p>I accept that some neighbouring properties will have a view across my land but I don't accept that there is any planning precedent for this to require the imposition of 'Important Open Space' marker. The District Council should not allow the VDS process to define the use of private</p>		

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>property in such a partisan way. Such decisions should come about through consistent and rigorous application of national and regional policy – such as the impending review of the local plan / LDF development and village boundary work.</p> <p>In the case of my land, the Parish Council has suggested that part of the site would be suitable for the provision of Affordable Housing in association with Northants Rural HA....</p> <p>It now appears that the VDS in draft form may cause an impediment to that worthwhile project and this illustrates how important it is not to let the remit of the VDS to stray into conflict with national planning policy.....For the VDS to describe my land as Important Open Space it in essence freezes the site in its present form...</p> <p>I do not object to the views marked being left in the VDS in so my neighbours opinions are noted as they would be anyway if any development or change of use were to be considered for the site. I ask that you amend the VDS to make my land the same status as the land adjacent to mine to the North (to the rear of Ladybower and Meadow Lodge) in the interests of consistency and fairness.</p>		

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
Dr Alice Smith, Landowner in Sibbertoft	Ditto Celia Lewis response, plus do not object to marking of Ash trees on the boundary with Church Street as important trees as feel they represent the most significant feature of the site as viewed from most angles.	Points noted	As above
Bruce Hattersley, Landowner in Sibbertoft	<p>Ditto Celia Lewis response, plus do not see how Important Views can go through Important Hedges and Trees.</p> <p>Previous applications have been refused partly on the grounds of loss of open space, but that view must be related to the respective development proposals....more recently planning permission granted on part of the site which demonstrates development may be suitable in the future.</p> <p>The respondent then included their ideas for potential future uses of the site.</p> <p>Hydrology – Also incidences of flooding at footpath near Dogyard.</p> <p>Such flooding in a hill top village is due to drainage problems at the point of flooding and resolution would be to press Anglian Water to improve drainage.</p> <p>VDS contains references to dynamic hydrology but are all views of local lay people – there has never been a professional survey to validate the assumptions in the guidelines, which if it is</p>	<p>Important open space can be defined in SPD</p> <p>Points noted</p> <p>Dogyard is mentioned in DS</p> <p>Amend DS to refer to this</p> <p>Amend DS to clarify in text that this is the opinion of the local community and Amend guideline as per comment, however recommend exclude</p>	<p>As above</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>to be SPG should be based on professional opinion. Suggested new guideline:</p> <p>In general there is a perceived risk of flooding in the lower parts of the village due to the extremely dynamic hydrology. Strong consideration should be given to taking expert hydrological advice when considering development in Sibbertoft that might increase the risk of flooding.</p>	<p>“that might increase the risk of flooding”</p>	
<p>Derek Hartshorne Resident of Sibbertoft</p>	<p>The last view to the north end of Westhorpe, on the left of the bridleway and pointing north-west – there is no view here unless you count corrugated iron sheep shelter which is about the only thing visible. A further combination of rising ground and hedgerows means nothing of value can be seen. It is possible that this arrow should have been at very end of Westhorpe where there are open views across countryside in all directions.</p>	<p>Senior Planning Officer confirms this is not an important view - remove arrow from DS</p>	<p>Amend DS</p>
<p>GE Roberts Resident of Sibbertoft</p>	<p>Object to important open view - very small paddock enclosed by high hedge not in line of vision of any house. Limited view is into it from corner gateway only, inside which land quickly rises and then falls away resulting in only view of surrounding hedgerow and sky</p>	<p>Senior Planning Officer confirms this is not an important view - remove arrow from DS</p>	<p>Amend DS</p>
<p>JR Lansdell Resident of Sibbertoft</p>	<p>Do not see how you can classify (Westhorpe) as an important open view....there is no real view at all and suggest should be taken out</p>	<p>Senior Planning Officer confirms this is not an important view - remove arrow from DS</p>	<p>Amend DS</p>

<b>Respondee</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Changes to Design Statement</b>
Mr and Mrs RA Pratt Resident of Sibbertoft	Object to view as cannot be seen and should not be included as it is misleading	Senior Planning Officer confirms this is not an important view - remove arrow from DS	Amend DS
Sibbertoft Design Group	<p>New map supplied to indicate important views – deleted all views from private properties</p> <p>Arrow which some villagers have found contentious (top of Westhorpe) retained as feel it is an open view</p> <p>Page 11 para.2 new text “The following...to the form, character and setting of the village and should be preserved”</p> <p>Page 11 para.3 new text “..palings. Possibly part of a former village green. Together with the vernacular architecture that fringes the paddock it forms a signature view as one enters Berkeley Street from the Welford/Naseby Road As...”.</p>	<p>Include new Map</p> <p>Senior Planning Officer has visited site and confirms that the view is in to a small field contained by a hedgerow with no views out of the field to beyond and hence would not be an important view</p> <p>Amend as proposed</p> <p>Amend as proposed</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS and Delete arrow</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>
<b>Whilton Parish Design Statement</b>			

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
Daventry District Council - Conservation	<p>Check saved policies in both Local Plan and Structure Plan and also reference to designated sites and areas – e.g. SLA, county wildlife sites – do these still have any significance?</p> <p>What about reference to Northamptonshire’s environmental character and green infrastructure suite or the extensive urban survey of Bannaventa carried out by NCC to inform description of character areas, issues and vulnerabilities?</p> <p><b>Page 6</b> – ‘Consultations show that residents prefer the village as it is and do not want to see material changes in relation to housing’. Is this appropriate? It is not the purpose of a VDS to be restrictive in this manner.</p> <p><b>5.1 Planning Guidelines – general</b> 5.1.1 these policies are no longer current.</p> <p>5.1.3 – look also at appropriate use of architectural detailing.</p> <p>5.1.4 – this is an opportunity to talk about</p>	<p>Confirm Special Landscape Area is still relevant and County Wildlife Sites are still designated hence both shall be retained</p> <p>Amend DS to highlight briefly that “Developers shall refer to the Northamptonshire environmental character and green infrastructure suite and the extensive urban survey of Bannaventa carried out by NCC” for further guidance.</p> <p>Amend DS to place this in the Parish Preferences section</p> <p>Amend DS to remove 5.1.1, as these policies are since this draft DS was prepared, not “saved Local Plan policies”.</p> <p>Amend DS to “The scale.... , architectural detailing, access and landscape .....”</p> <p>Amend DS to: “Sufficient</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS to remove these</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>potential over development of a site (and squeeze in the issue of backland development without specific reference to it?!)</p> <p>5.1.5 – and other locally significant materials.</p> <p>5.1.6 – must be sympathetic measures that do not detract from the character or appearance of the sites or area as a whole.</p> <p>5.1.7. – needs clarification? e.g. on domestic buildings in the core of the village? on traditional buildings with steeply pitched roofs? on prominent elevations visible from the public zone?</p> <p>5.1.8 Use of timber rather than uPVC. New window openings to respect proportions of house.</p> <p>5.1.12 requires clarification? Can't expect comprehensive landscaping scheme for ALL proposals. Look at nature, scale and location of development.</p>	<p>space.....around buildings to assist in preventing the over-development of a site. The layout of sites shall ensure adequate levels of amenity....occupants”.</p> <p>See Senior Planning Officer Comments below</p> <p>Amend DS to : “Crime...development. However, these measures must not detract from the character or appearance of the sites or area as a whole”.</p> <p>Amend DS to : “The use of ...discouraged on new and existing buildings on prominent elevations visible from public views”.</p> <p>Amend DS to : “When replacing...size, materials and style...”</p> <p>Amend DS and suggest alternative wording: “In determining a detailed planning application, regard will be had</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>5.1.13 Is this necessary? This is the wording of standard landscaping conditions attached to planning consents.</p> <p>Also – look at re-use of existing buildings. Design issues, certain types of development, etc.</p> <p><b>5.3 Planning Guidelines – Whilton village</b></p> <p>5.3.2 (and where appropriate enhanced...).</p> <p>5.3.4 – don't have to be negative – what kind of boundary detailing would be appropriate? (e.g. traditional stone and brick walling and native hedgerows).</p>	<p>to specific landscaping requirements particularly in relation to trees, hedges and other features contributing to the uniqueness of the site. In certain circumstances the determination of a planning application will be fully dependant upon the submission of a landscaping scheme at the application stage, rather than through the imposition of a planning condition”.</p> <p>There is no harm in reiterating this.</p> <p>DS concerns design issues and DG can decide what to include/exclude, therefore no amendment required</p> <p>Amend DS to incorporate this</p> <p>Amend DS to: "Wherever possible, traditional stone or brick walls and native hedgerows shall be used as</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>5.3.5 – doesn't belong in this section. It is a specific point, which could be dealt with more generally – e.g. where opportunities arise for new development or the alteration/extension of existing buildings traditional detailing such as boundary features should retained or re-instated.</p> <p>Look at parking issues on the main road through Whilton village and the need for further development to not create additional problems, and seek to improve.</p> <p><b>5.5 Planning Guidelines - Whilton Locks</b> More detail about size, scale and design of any new units or extensions to them. Look again at lighting, hard surfacing, etc.</p> <p>The main text in this section talks about</p>	<p>boundaries and these should be maintained in good condition”.</p> <p>Amend DS to: “Where opportunities arise for new development or the alteration/extension of existing buildings, traditional detailing such as boundary features should be retained or re-instated. Wherever possible stone walls, particularly dry stone walls, should be preserved.</p> <p>Amend DS to: “Any new developments must be designed to ensure that they do not exacerbate existing parking problems”.</p> <p>Amend DS to : “ New buildings facing Nobottle Road shall be of brick or stone with pitched roofs”. “The scale of any new building must respect the scale of existing buildings in the vicinity”.</p> <p>Amend DS page 7 to clearly</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>existing parking provision for the retail outlets and provision of new parking – this could be incorporated as a planning guideline.</p> <p><b>6.3 Planning Guidelines – Whilton Village and Locks</b></p> <p>Some of these points are not really planning issues – should they be incorporated in the parish preferences section instead?</p> <p>6.3.3 – what does this mean? – look at impact on immediate setting of the village and on wider parish landscape. Need to avoid sensitive locations and views into and out of the village.</p> <p>Also look at street furniture – e.g. retention</p>	<p>clarify existing text para.2 as a suggestion of the community – i.e remove “recommends” and replace with “the community believes it should be used for sympathetically....” The DS to be amended to include a new guideline under Whilton Locks 5.5, based on 5.6.3: “The appearance of the frontage to Nobottle Road should be enhanced to improve the setting and access to the canal including appropriate signage”</p> <p>Amend DS to move 6.3.2, 6.3.4, 6.3.5 to Preferences section.</p> <p>Amend DS to: “Careful...masts. They should not have an adverse impact on the immediate setting of the village or the wider parish landscape. It is important to avoid sensitive locations and preserve views into and out of the village”.</p> <p>Amend DS to: “Any new street</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	<p>of telephone box; sympathetic new furniture in terms of design, density and siting) that respects the character of the village.</p> <p><b>8.1 Planning Guidelines – Whilton Village and Locks</b> 8.1.2 – look at size and scale of buildings and any additions to them; also consider landscaping (both hard and soft), and lighting, signage, etc.</p> <p><b>8.2 Parish Preferences</b> 8.2.2 and 8.2.3 are planning matters. These statements could be adapted and incorporated into the planning guidelines section to carry more weight.</p> <p>Maps at the back are well produced and very useful.</p>	<p>furniture should respect the character of the village in terms of design, density and siting.</p> <p>“The red telephone box and its setting shall be protected and enhanced, as this feature is a listed building”.</p> <p>As per a previous change : “The scale of any new building must respect the scale of existing buildings in the vicinity”.</p> <p>8.2.2 is a planning land use, rather than design issue and hence should remain as a preference.</p> <p>8.2.3 to be adapted as a design guideline “Further business development shall be designed to ensure that it does not adversely affect the local community by reason of noise or other pollution”.</p> <p>Welcome comment</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>None</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>None</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	Can they also identify any negative/neutral areas for enhancement?	DG may include what contents they wish, therefore no change is required.	None
British Waterways	<p>We would very much like to see signage, either brown or fingerpost, from the settlement to the canal system and the development of circular walks from suitable settlements to the canal towpaths or reservoirs used for recreation and leisure.</p> <p>Pleased to read the Whilton village and locks design statement especially paragraph 5.6.3 with the Parish preference for an area for sufficient parking of not less than 8 cars reserved for a public car park with direct access to the canal. Paragraph 6.34 supports the creation of a footpath from Whilton village to Whilton Locks.</p>	<p>Amend DS as per previous change above ...including appropriate signage”</p> <p>Note the issue of promotion of circular walks is not a design issue</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
Richard Messinger – Individual	The enclosed "Map B Whilton Village" in the consultation document does not show the entire extent of the boundary of the eastern part of the village & would request that the entire eastern side of the village is shown down to Brington Lane including the full extent of roughmore spinney and areas to the eastern part of the village down to the brington lane, they are depicted on "Map A Whilton Village" defined in blue and for clarity would suggest that this area is	There are no features outside of Map B, which are not sufficiently shown on Map A. However, Map A will be amended so that the blue rectangle more accurately reflects the area covered by Map B.	Amend DS

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
	replicated on "Map B Whilton Village".		
Danetre	Whilton Parish expresses concern that new development would increase traffic but then notes its support for the Flore - Weedon bypass. A significant increase in population through major development would provide critical mass and further support for the case of the Flore - Weedon bypass.	Point noted	None
Whilton Group	<p>Design</p> <p>Wish to add page 6 under Whilton Locks – “The majority....Conservation Area (outlined red on map C). The views along the canal, with its historic infrastructure, are an important amenity enjoyed both by the local community and the visiting general public. Under...”</p> <p>Page 6 final para. to page 7 – “Diversification...apartments. A notable feature here is the view along the avenue of historic horse chestnut trees which makes a pleasant contrast to the otherwise commercial nature of the settlement. The stone...”</p> <p>8.2.1 amend to “No new dedicated....”</p>	<p>Amend as per text</p> <p>Amend as per text</p> <p>Amend as per text</p>	<p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p> <p>Amend DS</p>

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to Design Statement
Senior Planning Officer	<p>Page 7 EN5,6,7,9 are not Local Plan "saved" policies and therefore Para 5.1.1 needs to be removed</p> <p>5.1.5 we cannot require retention of buildings of sandstone or thatch unless they are Listed Buildings – this needs to be amended to reflect this</p> <p>Map C needs to clarify further the footnote i.e these are</p>	<p>Amend</p> <p>Amend to " Buildings....shall be retained wherever possible as they provide a key character feature within the village and the buildings.... Developers shall note that it is a requirement to retain these buildings where they are Listed"</p>	<p>Amend DS</p>

LONG BUCKBY VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT

Long Buckby Design Group held a series of open mornings at Long Buckby Library during the consultation period. The following provides a summary of key points made to the Design Group relating to the DS. These comments were submitted by e-mail to the Design Group or on comment slips at the Library Exhibition. A total of 20 were received:

**Comments Summary:**

Maps

Check for clarity and quality of final maps

Landscape Setting

Clarify what “higher ground” means S5

Railway

Upgrade the railway station  
Additional parking for station  
Access to station for disabled  
Concerns re- developing large gardens and backland development

Transport/Access

Improvements to access from canal/Wharf to Long Buckby  
Omission – traffic management – issue of HGVs – limit set on them  
Roads and traffic- split in to access to village and traffic within; parking; transit through village; cycleways; pedestrian ways  
Increase the traffic section  
20mph zone should be delineated with cobbles and traffic lights at crossings  
Safety of Station Road – speeding and visibility – traffic calming  
Roads close to Sportsfield congested at weekends with inconsiderate parking  
Walks around village should be well maintained

General Comments

Laudable objectives  
Overall document is excellent  
Thoughtful and comprehensive – interesting to see how the entrance to Long Buckby from the Wharf is improved – flowers maybe?

Comprehensive document – nothing to disagree – hope it can be implemented  
Agree with the DS and support fully  
Very impressed with DS.  
Who will remember this Statement in 5 years time?

**LONG BUCKBY VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT**

The paragraphs below set out the suggested alterations by the Long Buckby Design Group following the consultation exercise. The Council's response is included in a box after each item.

Section 2. Add a final sentence to the first paragraph;

The intention is that any future development of the village should be on this higher land and close to the village centre to facilitate access other than by car.

**Change**

This is a land use, not a design issue, however this can be adapted as a design issue see further below

Section 4. Replace the first and second paragraphs with the following;

The parish is crossed by a motorway, two separate railway lines and an electricity grid. These features are inevitably intrusive to some extent but overall the landscape remains attractive. The 'hill-top' nature of the main settlement gives rise to excellent views across the surrounding rural area. Most of these are seen from the public rights of way which allow easy access to the countryside. However there are some key viewpoints from within the village which it is important to protect. These are shown on Map 2. They are the following views; to Borough Hill from Station Hill; across the Watford Gap from Salem and Greenhill Road; Murcott as seen from Mill Hill; across the valley north-west from the churchyard; and looking to Vanderplanks Covert from the top of the Banks and the Leys.

The parish is not heavily wooded but Vanderplank's Covert is distinctive and tree planting has improved the valley which runs from Murcott along the north side of the village. This includes Willow Mill nature reserve, Lodge Farm (pond and wood), and the churchyard and cemetery. This area has the potential to be an increasingly important feature of the village landscape. Under the March 2001 County Structure Plan some parts of the south and east of the parish were designated as special landscape areas. Similarly the canals in the parish, together with pieces of nearby land are part of the Grand Union and Oxford Canals Conservation Area established in 1995.

**Change**

Amend DS to insert these new paragraphs, however amend text re- County Structure Plan reference as this policy is not a "saved policy". However, instead this can be highlighted under the Local Plan policy for SLA, which is a "saved policy" – new wording suggested as "Under the 1997 Daventry District Local Plan, some parts of the south and east.....1995".

Section 4. Move recommendations L3 and L4 to become S6 and S7 in Section 5. Re-number remaining recommendations.

**Change**

Amend DS as stated

Section 5. Insert a fifth paragraph as follows;

Open spaces are important features in the layout of the village. The majority of open spaces shown on Map 2 are either publicly owned or belong to churches or trusts. This may give them greater protection but any proposed development on nearby sites must respect their value and

significance. Of the two private spaces identified – Holmfield and the pond at the end of Marriott’s Road - the latter is considered by the community to have the higher amenity value and should be protected.

**Change**  
Amend DS as stated

Section 5. Amend recommendation S5 to the following;

The main village is based on a hill-top and has an elongated lay-out. Any future extensions to this shall be kept to the higher ground and near to the village centre so that it can be accessible on foot.

**Change**  
Amend text to: “...layout. Development should reflect this settlement pattern. This would also assist in encouraging more sustainable transport modes within the village”.

Section 6. Delete ‘And Spaces’ from title.

**Change**  
Amend as per this text

Section 6. Delete final paragraph beginning ‘ Spaces too can be....

**Change**  
Amend as per this text

Section 7. Amend recommendations R3, R4, and R5 as follows;

R3. The creation and enhancement of walkways and cycleways are encouraged in order to reduce car use around the village. This includes improved links between Long Buckby and Buckby Wharf.

R4. Any development must have regard to the pedestrian and cycle needs in the vicinity and ensure that links to existing paths and cycleways are maintained or provided.

R5. Proposals for estate development shall include consideration of the speed and flow of traffic and the need for on-street parking.

**Change**  
Amend as per this text

Map 2. This has been amended as follows;

The views have been reduced to six viewpoints from the village which between them protect three valuable in-parish views and the two wider views to Borough Hill and across the Watford Gap.

One piece of publicly owned land has been added. It is the playing field to the rear of the Infant School in the centre of the village. The pond area at the end of Marriott’s Road has been coloured yellow as it seems it is not publicly owned.

The Key has been altered from 'public spaces' to 'publicly owned spaces' and from 'viewpoints' to 'viewpoints and views'

**Change**

Changes to map as stated above

**DDC Required Changes for all and specific Design Statements**

Below are changes, which are based on the Council's required changes as a result of considering the reports to Planning Committee, Strategy Group and Full Council.

Note: "narrative text or narrative description" means the main text of the Design Statement, as opposed to Guideline sections.

**All Design Statements**

**Parking** – Design Groups to supply their own new text or amend existing text within their narrative description in highways/parking section to highlight the issue in this new required guideline -

"Parking shall be provided off-road. Exceptions to this shall be where this is inappropriate to the existing local layout/design character within the local area, for example in an area of terraced housing, where parking has been provided on street"

**Drainage** - new narrative text – "Areas of hard surface can create increased water run-off, which may result in flood risk. To assist in reducing this risk and manage water flow, all parking areas shall be designed to incorporate sustainable drainage systems. These can be provided through a variety of design techniques, such as permeable paving etc".

New guideline to read – "All parking areas are required to be designed to incorporate sustainable drainage systems".

**Specific Design Statements**

**Daventry Design Statement**

Replace first sentence in para 1 on page 10 with

Buildings should not be more than 2 1/2 - 3 storeys high in the town. Exceptional quality buildings that are of public or landmark status shall be considered in excess of this height limit. The scale of buildings should take into account the topography and location of the land.

**Naseby Design Statement**

Consultation Draft Site C2 – Agreed refer to this site as "Important Undeveloped Space", however also ensure that narrative text describes this area as "Site (*insert new reference site number*) is an Important Undeveloped Space, which provides important long views across it from the adjoining public right of way and the B4036 to the church spire, enhancing the setting of the church".