



KCPC Public Meeting – 16 June 2026 - Overview

The meeting was Chaired by Cllr Andrew Howard, supported by NNC Cllr Simon Fairhall and other members of the Kings Cliffe Parish Council.

The meeting briefed residents on North Northamptonshire Council's new Local Plan process (covering 2031–2045), clarified that no development decisions have been made, and focused on how to respond effectively to the current scoping consultation (deadline 1 July). Key themes were how Kings Cliffe is being positioned in the settlement hierarchy, the implications of potential “call for sites” proposals (including a very large airfield option), and what infrastructure and environmental constraints must be evidenced in consultation responses.

Local Plan status, timeline, and what's being consulted on now:

- Current stage is the scoping document (an audit of services/facilities, constraints, and broad direction), not a decision on specific developments.
- Consultation deadline for the scoping document: 1 July 2026.
- Next stages discussed:
 - Further consultation on draft plan content projected for autumn.
 - Further consultation on the draft local plan in 2027.
 - Target adoption of the new plan: January 2029.
- Rationale for having a plan: it provides structure/protection versus being driven by ad hoc developer applications.

Kings Cliffe baseline and existing allocations (context):

- Village profile cited: 2021 population 1,581; 636 houses.
- Previously adopted (2019) allocations noted as not yet completed:
 - Undeveloped part of the middle school site not yet developed.
 - Further development of Kings Mead industrial units not yet developed.
 - Dareswood Rise development is currently being built.

Settlement hierarchy and “key village” implications:

- Kings Cliffe is identified as a “key village” in the scoping document.
- Explanation of “key village” (as read from the document): settlements providing day-to-day services/facilities, reducing need to travel, focus for improved transport choices, and a limited level of growth appropriate to character/infrastructure capacity.
- Numbers and distribution discussed:
 - NNC areas: growth communities, market towns, key villages, rural areas.



- Housing target discussed as ~40,000–45,000 over ~20 years; growth towns to absorb just over two-thirds (~28,000), market towns about a quarter (~10,000), key villages 4% (~1,600 across 15 villages ≈ 112 each).
- Concerns and questions raised:
 - Whether being a key village is an advantage or disadvantage; some attendees requested parish council views.
 - Desire for clear settlement boundaries to avoid incremental “creep” development and loss of village character.

Potential development sites being referenced and why:

- Sites discussed as having been put forward via “call for sites” submissions (developer/landowner responses), not as adopted proposals:
 - Blatherwycke Road: potentially 183 houses.
 - Old Airfield: 2,657 houses (referenced as echoing the historic “Little Walston” proposal from 25–30 years ago that was rejected).
- **Notes from the scoping content referenced in discussion:**
 - Primary school near capacity (210 capacity; 196 pupils mentioned).
 - Blatherwycke Road described as narrow/twisty and not aligned to large-scale development.
 - Village described as low on facilities/services relative to size and not scoring high for accessibility.
 - Environmental/biodiversity sensitivity was noted as being picked up in the scoping document.
- **Residents’ views captured:**
 - Mixed views: at least one attendee expressed being “for” development; others emphasized constructive feedback and constraints.
 - One speaker supported airfield development on the basis of poor agricultural value and preferred continuity of the Kings Cliffe identity (not a separate settlement).
 - Emphasis that simply saying “no” is unlikely to be effective given national targets; focus should be on evidence-based constraints and shaping outcomes.

Infrastructure and service capacity topics raised for consultation feedback:

- **Healthcare:**
 - Repeated emphasis that GP/surgery capacity is a top concern; surgery is affiliated into Cambridgeshire & Peterborough (risk of being “off the NNC map”).
 - Wider healthcare pressures raised (community/district nursing, palliative care, hospital capacity).
 - Parking at the surgery noted as problematic.
 - Mention that a surgery-related meeting occurred last year with multiple councils re: impacts of nearby developments; surgery partners are aware of capacity pressures;



Simon contacted Helen Eastwood to prompt surgery engagement in the Local Plan consultation.

- Education:

- Primary school near capacity noted; question raised about secondary capacity (Prince William School / Oundle School) and whether it is already constrained.

- Counterpoint raised: overall child population is reportedly dropping; nearby primaries may be at risk of declining rolls, so school planning needs a wider-area view.

- Transport, roads, and accessibility:

- Rural transport gaps highlighted; difficulty accessing/being included in cross-border schemes.

- **Safety and village conditions:** parking chaos noted; public suggestion of 20 mph limits in the village.

- A43 junction capacity concerns raised (especially with other planned growth such as Corby expansion); broader road network concerns noted.

- Utilities and enabling infrastructure:

- Sewerage and electricity capacity flagged as constraints needing to be addressed prior to further housing growth.

- Employment:

- Question raised about employment provision alongside large-scale housing (e.g., 2,500+ homes and associated job needs).

- Noted that the map includes employment sites (separate layer); examples cited included potential warehouse/employment sites west of Thrapston and near Corby (by the tip area), with expectation that most employment allocations will cluster near growth/market towns.

- Brownfield/empty homes:

- Public question raised about whether vacant/derelict housing and redevelopment opportunities meaningfully reduce new-build need across NN.

- NNC policy change noted: empty homes liable for double council tax as a financial incentive to bring them back into use.

- Question raised about the completeness/up-to-dateness of the brownfield/land register; Simon did not know and offered to ask.

Neighbourhood Plan, middle school site, and local control

- Discussion that neighbourhood plans may have reduced weight once a new Local Plan resets settlement boundaries/allocations under updated national policy; however, the neighbourhood plan's evidence and site assessments may still be valuable to submit as part of consultation responses.

- Middle school site:

- Seen by some as an opportunity to meet a meaningful portion of any local allocation and avoid outward expansion.

- A belief stated that proposals may come forward this summer to sell the old middle school site to a developer; selling would create risk of an outcome not aligned with village priorities.



- Question raised about whether the surgery could purchase/relate to the site; response was that prior discussions were complex and not a straightforward purchase.
- Idea proposed: if the middle school site remains undeveloped longer, it could absorb a “nominal” allocation later (thereby reducing pressure for greenfield expansion).
- Desire expressed to “manage our own agenda” via a village masterplan/working group that sets out what housing and enabling infrastructure the village could accept, to better influence outcomes.

Environmental constraints and cross-border impacts

- Environment and biodiversity:

- Concern raised that environment was not sufficiently foregrounded in discussion; response noted that biodiversity/sensitive areas are recognised in the scoping document and could support arguments against unsuitable growth.
- Question raised about consultation with Rockingham-related bodies (Rockingham Forest Trust / similar); Cllr Fairhall offered to check whether they have been consulted.

- Contamination and former uses:

- **Scoping document reference noted:** potential contamination from brownfield land; Kings Cliffe referenced alongside Collyweston re: slate mines and former Ministry of Defence uses/landfill (airfield assumed to be included as former MoD).
- Unexploded ordnance was mentioned as a possible consideration (raised from the floor).

- Cross-border developments:

- Strong encouragement to comment on developments outside NNC boundaries that will still affect the area (traffic/infrastructure), including:
 - West “Wittering” (as stated) 3,000–5,000 homes (possible).
 - St George’s Barracks (Rutland) proposals.
 - Stamford north growth (some in Rutland).
 - Warehousing proposed at A1 services.
- Tressham Garden Village: conflicting messages reported by Cllr Fairhall - some say it has “lost its chance” and will fall off; others (former deputy leader/local MP) say it is coming forward. Andrew wrote seeking clarity and is arranging a meeting. Also described as proposed on Deenethorpe airfield (~1,500 homes; first mooted in 2016).

Engagement, access to documents, and community input process

- Where to find documents:

- Link/QR code on meeting poster; NNC website link referenced.
- Also linked via community Facebook page and parish council post related to the meeting.

- Parish council process for gathering community input:

- Clerk to repost links and set up a separate page for residents to submit comments for collation into the parish response (within ~24–36 hours).
- Residents encouraged to submit responses directly to NNC as well as sending their comments to Clerk to help shape a balanced parish council response.



- Inclusivity / offline access:

- Suggestions for residents without internet/Facebook: ask friends/neighbours to help; submit handwritten comments via the parish council office letterbox at Kings Cliffe Active addressed to the Clerk of the Parish Council.

- **Proposal raised:** host a drop-in session at Kings Cliffe Active/Cross Keys Inn cafe (e.g., weekend) with laptops and helpers to support residents to submit consultation responses; chair agreed to take this away for consideration.

Action items

- Clerk to repost consultation links and supporting documents on Facebook and the parish council channels (within ~24–36 hours).

- Clerk to set up a separate online MS form for residents to submit comments to be collated into the parish council's scoping consultation response (within ~24–36 hours).

- Cllr Fairhall to proceed with the arranged meeting to clarify the status of Tresham Garden Village (conflicting signals; meeting being set up after Simon wrote to stakeholders).

- Cllr Fairhall to ask NNC about the status/completeness of the brownfield/land register and what is being done to keep it up to date.

- Cllr Fairhall to check whether Rockingham Forest Trust / relevant Rockingham woodland bodies have been consulted and report back.

- Parish council to consider and decide whether to run an in-person drop-in support session at Kings Cliffe Active/Cross Keys Inn Cafe (laptops/help) to enable offline residents to submit consultation responses before the 1 July deadline.

Additional:

- **Parish council vacancies:**

- Two spare seats/vacancies on the parish council were announced and all information will be shared with the community on Friday.