

**North Northamptonshire Area Planning Committee
(Thrapston)
29 March 2023**

Application Reference	NE/22/01273/FUL
Case Officer	Patrick Reid
Location	27 Bradfield Close, Rushden, NN10 0EP
Development	Proposed detached dwelling and associated works.
Applicant	Mr Hassan Ali
Agent	Mr Kumbirai Mbofana
Ward	Rushden South
Overall Expiry Date	06 December 2022
Agreed Extension of Time	05 April 2023

List of Appendices

Appendix - Copy of Appeal Decision from the site dated 17.05.2018 ref. 3194974.

Scheme of Delegation

The application is brought before the Area Planning Management Committee because Rushden Town Council have objected to the application and the officer recommendation is for approval.

1. Recommendation

- 1.1 That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions.

2. The Proposal

- 2.1 The application proposes a two-storey detached dwelling as well as the associated land including a parking area and outside amenity space. It would

be created through the use of space associated with no. 27. The space of no. 27 would be used, reducing the space available to it. The proposed shows the removal of a garage to the side of no. 27, however, from the site visit it is apparent that has already happened.

- 2.2 The proposed dwelling would be rectangular in footprint and would be set back from the road. It would have a pitched roof and is designed to have its principal elevation facing the road, with two windows either side and at first floor level. The brickwork and roof tiles proposed are to match those of the adjacent dwellings.
- 2.3 Externally, a single parking space would be created to the front of the new house. The space would measure around 5.4m in width and 7m in depth. There also would be space for three bins and a gap to allow pedestrian access to the side of the house leading to the garden. At the rear, the gap from the rear elevation to the rear fence would be around 5.4m. The boundary between the new dwelling and no. 27 would be defined by a 1.8m tall close boarded fence to separate the two rear gardens.
- 2.4 Internally, the dwelling would include living space at ground floor including a lounge, dining area and separate kitchen and w.c. At first floor there would be a bedroom, bathroom and study.

3. Site Description

- 3.1 The application site comprises land associated with no. 27 Bradfield Close, a semi-detached two-storey dwelling. The site is positioned in a residential area. The character of the properties is broadly similar albeit they vary in their design. The site is positioned on the western side of the cul-de-sac, with no. 27 to the north and 25 to the south. To the rear of the site are properties off Allen Road. The rear garden of no. 27 backs onto the rear garden of that of no. 127 Allen Road and a public play area.
- 3.2 The application site includes hedging and vegetation positioned between the two houses either side, numbers 25 and 29. No. 27 is set further forward, closer to the road than no. 25. The site is associated in planning terms with no. 27 Bradfield Close. From the site visit however, the site appears to have been physically separated from the garden/land of no. 27 by fencing.
- 3.3 Planning permission was granted for a house on the site via a combination of the outline and reserved matters consents ref. 17/01378/OUT and 19/01423/REM. The application site is located within 3km of the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits Special Protection Area (SPA).

4. Relevant Planning History

- 4.1 NE/22/01221/REM – Approval of reserved matter pursuant to 17/01378/OUT. Outline Planning Application for the demolition of the existing garage and erection of a one bedroomed dwelling. The application was submitted in outline form with all matters except access reserved for

later consideration. The decision was taken to appeal after it had previously been refused and was later overturned by the Independent Inspectorate. Appearance, Landscaping, Layout, Scale – Withdrawn – 27.09.2022

- 4.2 19/01423/REM - Reserved matters: Appearance, Landscaping, Layout, Scale pursuant to 17/01378/OUT: demolition of the existing garage and erection of a one bedroomed dwelling – Approved 27.11.2019
- 4.3 17/01378/OUT – Outline Planning Application for the demolition of the existing garage and erection of a one bedroomed dwelling. – Refused 18.12.2017 – Appeal Allowed 17.05.2018

Extract of Inspector comments: *“Consequently, I cannot consider that this outline proposal would appear cramped and instead it would harmonise well with the character of the area. As such it would comply with part d) of Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which seeks to ensure development responds to local character. It would also accord with Policy EN1 of the Rushden Neighbourhood Plan which says that development should respect the prevailing density and pattern of surrounding development, albeit this Plan is still to be adopted and so its policies carry limited weight.”*

5. Consultation Responses

A full copy of all comments received can be found on the Council's website [here](#)

5.1 Rushden Town Council

Comments summarised as follows:

- It does not represent good design as sought by paragraph 134 of the NPPF;
- The study could be used as a bedroom, and in this circumstance the bedroom would not meet the National Space Standards and neither would the overall floorspace;
- It is also recognised that the Council's Householder Extensions Supplementary Planning Document stipulates at paragraph 3.11 that “(unless properties are already in closer proximity), any new windows at first floor level or above should respect the ‘back to back’ distance of at least 21 metres between rear facing windows which has become the accepted in the discipline of planning over the years as being sufficient to avoid unacceptable overlooking into the windows of properties to the rear”;
- The rear of the house would be around 17m away from a neighbouring property off Allen Road. The proposal would risk setting a harmful precedent for separation distances in this location, given it would be out of keeping with its surroundings;
- The Council's Householder Extensions SPD also sets out at paragraph 5.2 that it is recommended that the Council will typically seek at least 50sqm of garden space to be retained as a reasonable amount of useable amenity space, and that a typical garden is 10.5m

long (which ties in with the 21m 'back to back' distance for separation standards). The proposal falls below these standards;

- The proposal is also contrary to Policy 8(e) of the Core Strategy & EN1 of the Rushden Neighbourhood Plan which require acceptable levels of residential amenity to be achieved and existing neighbouring amenity to be preserved and the proposal would be overbearing;
- draft Policy EN13 of the Part 2 Local Plan requires development proposal to relate well to and enhance the surrounding environment; achieving well designed amenity space of an adequate size for the property and serve the needs of all end users;
- Conflict with Rushden Neighbourhood Plan Policy EN1 which requires development to preserve existing neighbouring amenity and should not appear overbearing.

5.2 Neighbours / Responses to Publicity

One representation has been received which raised the following concerns:

- Concern that the plot/application site is associated with no. 27;
- A garage proposed to be demolished was done so prior to April 2019.

5.3 Local Highway Authority (LHA)

In respect of the above planning application, the local highway authority (LHA) has the following observations, comments and recommendations:

- The applicant must provide the necessary 2 metres x 2 metres pedestrian visibility splays required on both sides of the access. These splays must be contained fully within the applicant's site and not include any public highway land, or any other third party owned land. The splays shall be permanently retained and kept free of all obstacles to visibility over 0.6 metres in height above access / footway level.
- The applicant is required to provide the correctly dimensioned parking spaces; parking spaces will need to measure 3 metres x 5.5 metres, in line with the detail contained within the NNC Adopted Parking Standards. When a single driveway is between structures it must be widened to be 3.3 metres. This is consistent with internal width dimensions required for a single garage. This allows for the opening of doors and room to walk around vehicles.
- Tandem parking scenarios should be minimised, and there should be no tandem car parking in blocks of three. Tandem parking scenarios often lead to an increase in on street parking.
- A means of drainage across the back of the highway boundary, across the proposed site access draining to soakaways contained within the applicant's own land is required.
- The applicant will be required to obtain the correct licensing, from Northamptonshire Highways Regulations in order to install or alter the site access and the vehicle crossover of public highway land.

5.4 Environmental Protection

We have no objection to the proposal but suggest the conditions are included in any permissions granted (conditions relating to construction hours and preventing burning).

5.5 Natural England

Designated sites [European] no objection subject to securing appropriate mitigation for recreational pressure impacts on habitat sites (European sites).

6. Relevant Planning Policies and Considerations

6.1 Statutory Duty

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

6.2 National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

National Design Guide (NDG) (2019)

6.3 North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) (2016)

Policy 1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy 4 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Policy 5 - Water Environment, Resources and Flood Risk Management

Policy 8 - North Northamptonshire Place Shaping Principles

Policy 9 - Sustainable Buildings

Policy 11 - The Network of Urban and Rural Areas

Policy 28 - Housing Requirements

Policy 29 - Distribution of new homes

Policy 30 - Housing Mix and Tenure

6.4 Rushden Neighbourhood Plan (made 2018)

Policy H1 – Settlement Boundary

Policy H2 – Location of new housing development

Policy H4 – Market housing type and mix

Policy EN1 – Design in development

Policy EN2 – Landscaping in development

Policy T1 – Development generating a transport impact

6.5 Emerging East Northamptonshire Local Plan (LPP2) (submission version March 2021)

EN1: Spatial development strategy

EN2: Settlement boundary criteria – urban areas

EN10: Enhancement and provision of open space
EN12: Health and wellbeing
EN12: Design of Buildings/Extensions
EN13: Designated Heritage Assets
EN29: Delivering wheelchair accessible housing
EN30: Housing mix and tenure to meet local need
EN31: Older people's housing provision
EN32: Self and custom build housing

6.6 Other Relevant Documents

Northamptonshire County Council - Local Highway Authority Standing Advice for Local Planning Authorities (2016)

Northamptonshire County Council - Local Highway Authority Parking Standards (2016)

7. Evaluation

The key issues for consideration are:

- Principle of Development
- Visual Impact
- Impact on Neighbouring Amenity
- Highway Matters
- Environmental Matters
- Flood Risk and Drainage
- Ecology
- Waste Management

7.1 Principle of Development

7.1.1 The application site is located within Rushden which is identified in the JCS as a 'Growth Town', the highest category of settlement in the plan's hierarchy. For Rushden, new dwellings are considered acceptable in principle. The site is within a residential area and the provision of a new dwelling is compliant with policies 11, 28 and 29 in respect of the principle.

7.2 Visual Impact

7.2.1 A key consideration is the recent appeal decision 3194974 that related to an application seeking outline permission with all matters reserved save for access, for a dwelling on the site. The appeal was allowed on 17 May 2018 (appendix 1) and was made under the same local planning policy context as currently albeit the Part 2 Local Plan has progressed closer to adoption since. The NPPF was under an earlier version at that time, but the changes under the current 2021 version do not materially affect the policy context. The Inspector's decision was made under a policy context that was fundamentally the same as currently. The physical context has also not materially changed.

7.2.2 The appealed application had been refused for two reasons: firstly, impact on the local character and secondly, impact on neighbouring amenities. The Inspector considered both matters and found them to be acceptable in planning terms. The Inspector's comment at paragraph 6 is considered relevant to the proposal:

'Consequently, I cannot consider that this outline proposal would appear cramped and instead it would harmonise well with the character of the area.'

7.2.3 Subsequent to the outline planning permission, Reserved Matters were approved under 19/01423/REM in November 2019. The appearance, landscaping, layout and scale were approved resulting in a permission that could have been implemented. The Reserved Matters including condition 1 which required that the development be begun within two years. There is no indication that the works began and as such the planning permission lapsed.

7.2.4 The dwelling approved under the Reserved Matters in 2019 was near identical to that currently proposed. The approved was in the same location using the same footprint and design as currently, incorporating a bedroom and a study at first floor level. The layout of the site is identical to that approved, including the extent of garden/external amenity space and the parking arrangements shown for the proposed dwelling and no. 27. The approved scheme in 2019 and that currently proposed are materially the same.

7.2.5 The recent planning permissions are material planning considerations and weigh in favour of the current proposal. The development proposed is considered under a planning policy context that is materially the same as then, both in terms of national and local planning policy. The design of the proposed house is nearly identical to that approved and the consideration of the design remains as previously determined.

7.2.6 The siting of the house, its scale and design are considered to be reflective of the locality and take suitable account of the nature of the space available on the site. The house would assimilate suitably into the street scene and it is considered the design is acceptable in planning terms.

7.2.7 The Town Council have objected on the basis of the proposal not being sufficiently well designed in terms of the extent of garden space for the house. This matter is discussed later in the report on the topic of private amenity.

7.3 **Impact on Neighbouring Amenity**

No. 27 Bradfield Close

7.3.1 To the north of the site is no. 27 and the house would be separated from it by the space for the parking of two cars associated with no. 27 and a pedestrian route to the rear of the proposed house. The side elevation of no. 27 does not include any windows and nor does the northern side of the proposed house. The first-floor rear windows of the house may allow some

view of the rear part of the garden of no. 27, but this is an acceptable relationship.

- 7.3.2 The proposed house would not cause a materially harmful impact on the outlook of no. 27. The house would result in some overshadowing of the garden of no. 27 due to it being south of it. However, the garden would still benefit from sufficient daylight and the impact on direct sunlight is not considered harm that would warrant the refusal of the proposed dwelling.
- 7.3.3 The development would remove land associated with no. 27 as a planning unit through its division. The extent of garden/amenity land that would remain with no. 27 is considered proportionate to the size of the dwelling and acceptable.

No. 25 Bradfield Close

- 7.3.4 To the south of the site is no. 25 which has an adjoining garage/store on the northern side which would be close to the side of the proposed house. A first-floor side window serving the bathroom would not cause a loss of privacy of no. 25 in part due to the nature of the use of the room and that there are no windows in the side of 25.. The bedroom windows would also not cause a material loss of privacy.
- 7.3.5 The dwelling would otherwise not cause any unacceptable impact on outlook or the extent of daylight reaching no. 25.

127 Allen Road

- 7.3.6 To the rear/west of the site is no. 127 which has its garden backing onto part of the application site. The property has a timber shed in its garden and a conservatory at the rear of the property. The separation between the first floor of the proposed house and the main rear wall of no. 127 Allen Road is around 19.5 metres when measured off the plans. Plans of no. 127 are not available but it is anticipated the rear facing first floor windows serve bedrooms.
- 7.3.7 The potential for overlooking from the bedroom windows of the proposed dwelling onto the rear windows and garden space of no. 127 needs to take into account the factors of the separation, the nature of the spaces and windows and well as any intervening objects/features, including trees. A further factor is the extent to which the garden and windows of no. 127 benefit from privacy or an extent of overlooking currently.
- 7.3.8 The Town Council (TC) have objected citing concern about the separation distance being less than 21 metres. The Supplementary Planning Document 'Householder Extensions SPD' is cited by the TC. The document provides guidance for householder extensions but nevertheless, the TC make the case it is relevant for the proposed dwelling. Paragraph 3.11 of the document, which is positioned within the section under: 'How an extension fits in with the character of the surroundings', includes the following wording:

'In addition, unless properties are already in closer proximity, any new windows at first floor level or above should respect the 'back to back' distance of at least 21 metres between directly facing rear windows which has become accepted in the discipline of planning over the years as being sufficient to avoid unacceptable overlooking into the windows of properties to the rear. Where properties with directly facing windows are already less than 21 metres apart, a judgement will be made as to whether the extension results in a significantly worse situation in terms of overlooking than that which already exists. Finally, where rear facing windows are at an angle to each other, a shorter distance between dwellings may be possible if the case officer is satisfied that the angle involved reduces the amount of overlooking between them sufficiently to protect the privacy of residents in both properties.'

7.3.9 In assessing the impact on no. 127, the separation is an important factor. A bedroom window to bedroom window separation of around 19.5m at the nearest point is evidently less than the guidance for householder extensions. On the site however, it was apparent that there are mature trees that obscure much of the view to the rear elevation of no. 127. The trees appear well established and there is no indication that the works or other causes would result in the removal of the trees. Therefore, it would be reasonable to expect that the trees will remain and provide a screen, preventing a significant extent of views between the properties. The Agent has advised the trees will remain and be unaffected by the development.

7.3.10 In assessing the impact with no. 127 Allen Road, the separation of 19.5 metres is considered to be sufficient to ensure an acceptable relationship in terms of privacy between the bedroom windows of no. 127 and the bedroom of the proposed house. The guidance of 21m cited in the Householder Extension SPD needs to be considered with an appropriate level of regard. It is guidance rather than an absolute necessity. Additionally, it is intended for householder extensions that this proposal does not represent. The presence of mature trees also provides a significant amount of screening that would limit views between the windows also. There is no indication that the trees will be removed and as such it is reasonable to consider they will remain indefinitely. For these reasons, the relationship between the two properties is considered acceptable.

7.4 Highway Matters

7.4.1 The proposed dwelling would be accessed off Bradfield Close and would have space for a single vehicle to be parked. The development also would involve the rearrangement of the parking space for no. 27, resulting in it having space for two vehicles to be parked to its side. As part of the application, the Local Highway Authority (LHA) have provided comments referring to the standard guidance, including the dimensions for parking spaces.

7.4.2 In terms of the proposed dwelling, it would have one bedroom and one study. The parking standards indicate that for a one-bedroom property, one on-site space should be provided. The first-floor study is relatively small in floorspace at around 6.92 sqm, which is less than the minimum size that the

National Space Standards set out for a bedroom (7.5 sqm). It is considered appropriate that this space not be considered a bedroom for this reason. Therefore, it should only be considered as a space for being a non-bedroom, such as a study or a store. Therefore, the parking provision on the site is considered appropriate.

7.4.3 The adjacent no. 27 currently is served by space for parking to its side, similar to that shown on the proposed plans. The space available allows for two vehicles to be parked. This arrangement is the same as currently exists and the development would not change this.

7.4.4 The proposal would result in a suitable provision of parking for the proposed house and would not materially affect that of no. 27, which would continue to have two spaces. Access onto and off the proposed driveway, whilst requiring a reversing manoeuvre, is considered acceptable in the cul-de-sac location due to the low number of vehicular movements and low speeds.

7.5 **Private Amenity**

7.5.1 Policy 30 of the JCS requires that applications for new dwellings demonstrate the accommodation meets National Space Standards. The floorspace of the house is measured from the plans to be around 71sqm which exceeds the 58sqm minimum. The bedroom also exceeds the minimum space.

7.5.2 The study space is insufficiently large to be a bedroom, but as it is proposed as a study then the proposal is treated as such. The space is acceptable as a space for a study.

7.5.3 Internally, the dwelling will be served by rear ground floor windows to serve the lounge and dining area. These windows will allow light into the space to ensure acceptable levels of daylight. The bedroom, kitchen and study will also benefit from acceptable levels of daylight and outlook.

7.5.4 Externally, the dwelling will have a front driveway with space beside the area for parking. To the side and rear the dwelling will have a garden that will be defined from those adjacent by close boarded fencing. Concern has been raised by the Town Council that the garden is insufficient. In considering the size, it is necessary to note the proposal is for a single bedroom dwelling and as such would be occupied by less people than a 2 or 3 bedroom dwelling. The external space to the side gate is around 42sqm, which does then extend along the side also. The space available is considered to provide more than sufficient external amenity space for the one-bedroom dwelling.

7.6 **Environmental Matters**

7.6.1 Environmental Protection have been consulted on the above application and not objected. The suggested conditions relating to construction hours and controls are considered reasonable to limit the impact of a potential future construction.

7.7 Flood Risk and Drainage

7.7.1 As the proposal is minor in nature and within Flood Zone 1, there is no validation requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment. There also is no indication that the development would materially increase the risk of flooding locally or on site. As such, the proposal is acceptable in this regard.

7.8 Ecology

7.8.1 The application site, at the time of the site visit, included some rubble and some overgrown vegetation on the site. It appeared to have been separated by a fence from no. 27 and a hedge on the alternate site marks its general boundary. There was no indication that the site itself provides ecological value of significance.

7.8.2 The site is within 3km of the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits Special Protection Area (SPA) and the associated SPD notes that new dwellings can cause an impact on the bird populations of the SPA. To mitigate the impact, a financial contribution towards schemes to help the populations was requested and this was received and secured by the associated form. As such, the impact is considered to be adequately mitigated.

7.8.3 The direct on-site and wider SPA impact are considered to be neutral. The previous planning permission found the proposal to be acceptable in ecological terms also. It is considered therefore that the proposal is acceptable in this regard.

7.9 Waste Management

7.9.1 The layout provides sufficient space for the storage of waste and recycling bins to the front of the property. There is sufficient space for presenting bins on collection days.

8. Other Matters

8.1 Neighbour comments: One representation received raised a query primarily relating to the ownership of the site and the connection of the application with no. 27. Whilst the site may have been 'sold' from connection with 27, in planning terms it remains part of its planning unit. The second matter notes that the previous adjoining garage of no. 27 has been demolished as a matter of fact. This does not affect the consideration of the application

8.2 Equality: The application raises no matters of particular equality concern.

8.3 Health Impact Assessment: Paragraph 92 of the NFFP states planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe communities and, specifically, criterion c) of this seeks to enable and support healthy lifestyles, for example, through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure, sports facilities, local shops, access to healthier food, allotments and layouts which encourage walking and cycling. It is considered that the proposal subject to this application will enable many of these aims

to be achieved and therefore it is considered acceptable on health impact grounds.

9. Conclusion / Planning Balance

- 9.1 The proposal is near identical that was subject of recently lapsed planning permission 19/01423/REM. There have been no material changes in either the planning policy or physical context of the site that alter the previous consideration of the proposal.
- 9.2 The proposed house is considered to be acceptable in principle, access, the ecological impact, and drainage. The impact on the amenities of nearby properties is considered to be acceptable and the house itself would benefit from acceptable levels of amenity. The proposal is considered to comply with the relevant policies of the development plan.

10. Recommendation

- 10.1 That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions.

11. Conditions

1. The works hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Site and Location Plans ref. BCR-01B;
- Site Layout Plans and Street Views ref. BCR-02A;
- Floor Plans and Elevations as Proposed ref. BCR-03A.

Reason: To define the terms of the planning permission and to ensure that the development is carried out as permitted.

3. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, details of the external finishes/materials of the building, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the work shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved scheme and retained in perpetuity thereafter. The details shall include the materials for the external walls, roof, doors and window frames.

Reason: To achieve a satisfactory elevational appearance for the development to comply with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

4. Prior to commencement of development full details of both hard and soft landscape works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Subsequently, these works shall be carried out as approved. The landscaping details to be submitted shall include:
- a) proposed finished levels;
 - b) means of enclosure;
 - c) hard surfacing, other hard landscape features and materials, including a means of drainage across the front of the site adjacent the highway;
 - d) existing trees, hedges or other soft features to be retained;
 - e) planting plans, including specifications of species, sizes, planting centres number and percentage mix;

Reason: The landscaping details of this site is required in order ensure the external spaces are appropriately designed to ensure the development assimilates well into Bradfield Close.

5. No demolition or construction work (including deliveries to or from the site) shall take place on the site outside the hours of 0800 and 1800 Mondays to Fridays and 0800 and 1300 on Saturdays, and at no times on Sundays, Bank Holidays or Public Holidays unless otherwise agreed with the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the protection of the local amenity throughout construction works.

6. There shall be no burning of any material during construction, demolition or site preparation works.

Reason: To minimise the threat of pollution and disturbance to local amenity.

12. Informatives

1. Conditions 3 and 4 require details to be approved prior to the commencement of development. The Applicant as agreed to these conditions.
2. Please note also that the works necessary to be undertaken within publicly maintained highway land must be undertaken only by a Northamptonshire Highways Approved Contactor; who has the required and necessary public liability insurance in place.
3. The North Northamptonshire Joint Core Spatial Strategy 2011-2031 policy 10 (e), Provision of Infrastructure, encourages developers to provide for fast broadband to new buildings (including but not exclusive to housing, commercial, retail or leisure). This should be gigabit capable and where

possible, full fibre broadband connectivity. Early agreement with a telecoms provider is key to being able to enhance your asset. The network capability delivered by full fibre technology supports the fastest broadband speeds available, is considered future proof, and will bring a multitude of opportunities, savings and benefits. It may also add value to the development and is a major selling point to attract potential homebuyers and occupiers, with many people now regarding fast broadband as one of the most important considerations. Proposals should be compliant with Part R, Schedule 1 of the Building Regulations 2010 (soon to be amended to strengthen requirements for gigabit connectivity to new dwellings) and the Approved Document R.

Some telecoms network providers have dedicated online portals providing advice for developers, including:

Openreach Developer Portal (openreach.co.uk)

Virgin Media <http://www.virginmedia.com/lightning/network-expansion/property-developers>

Gigaclear networkbuildcare@gigaclear.com (rural areas and some market towns)

OFNL (GTC) <http://www.ofnl.co.uk/developers>

CityFibre <http://cityfibre.com/property-developers>

Details of other fibre network providers operating locally can be found here <http://www.superfastnorthamptonshire.net/how-we-are-delivering/Pages/telecoms-providers.aspx>.

For help and advice on broadband connectivity in North Northamptonshire please email bigidea.ncc@northnorthants.gov.uk