



Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Parish Council

Northamptonshire

Chairman of the Council: Cllr A.R.Dale

Clerk to the Council: Mr M.H.Hunter LLB (Hons) Principal ILCM

Ref: O/2013/016/ARD

Tel: 07850 570007

E-mail: Clerk@chelveston.org.uk

Web: www.chelveston.org.uk

Ashbury
Caldecott
Wellingborough
Northants
NN9 6AR

15th May 2013

Dear Resident,

Back in December 2012/January 2013, we held an exhibition and conducted a survey across the Parish to gauge opinion on whether and how Chelveston-cum-Caldecott should develop over the next 10, 20 and 30 years.

The results from this survey have now been analysed and are being shared with all residents for information and comment. This is the next step in the creation of our "Neighbourhood Development Plan", a legal document which will provide the planning framework for all future development in the Village. Without such a plan, the Parish will be unable to manage pressure from developers who might wish to take advantage of land that might become available in the Village. With such a plan, we can specify where, how much and what type of development should be permitted.

Once residents have had chance to digest this information, we will be asking for volunteers to join a Parish Council working party to create the Neighbourhood Development Plan. This plan will be independently examined by a professional consultant (paid for by ENC) to ensure that it is properly evidenced and lawful and will then be put to a referendum of all electors in the Parish. If a majority of electors express support for the plan, then it becomes one of the guiding documents that developers and planners must follow.

If you have any questions or comments on the results or would like to join the working party, then please contact the Clerk or me by phone, letter or email (or stop me in the street!).

Thanks in advance for your input



Cllr Adrian R. Dale
Chairman of the Parish Council



Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Parish Council



Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Neighbourhood Development Plan - Questionnaire "Preserving our Past and Enhancing our Future"

Results of the 2012/2013 Neighbourhood Development Questionnaire

The responses from the Neighbourhood Development Questionnaire were collated by East Northamptonshire Council (ENC) and data was provided anonymously for analysis by the Parish Council. The raw results are presented for residents in this report, together with a commentary and analysis prepared by Cllr Adrian Dale. The commentary and analysis are intended for discussion by residents and are in no way intended to be seen as Parish Council policy.

After collecting comments and ideas from residents, a working party will create a Neighbourhood Development Plan which will be presented for adoption to all residents in a referendum. If adopted, then this plan will have a statutory status and must be used by the planning authority (ENC) to guide future development of the Village.

Co-Ordinators

Cllr Adrian Dale
21 Water Lane
Chelveston
Wellingborough
Northants
NN9 6AP
(01933) 622624
adrian.dale@creatifica.com

Mark Hunter
Ashbury
Caldecott
Wellingborough
Northants
NN9 6AR
(01933) 626039
clerk@chelveston.org.uk

1. Background

Although the last 20 years have seen limited development, Chelveston has actually grown by over 50% in the last 50 years with new housing in Water Lane, Duchy Close, Britten Close, Raunds Road, High Street, Kimbolton Road and Disbrowe Court. Caldecott has expanded by 30% over 50 years.

Since the early 1990s, Chelveston-cum-Caldecott has been designated in the District Local Development Plan as a “restricted in-fill village” – meaning that housing development has been restricted to filling in gaps between existing houses. 17 new properties were built during this period.

The District Local Development Plan runs out in 2014 and will be replaced by the Four Towns Plan running up until 2031. This plan will contain a section on Chelveston-cum-Caldecott and will define what type of development will be permitted in the Parish in the future. Residents have the opportunity to contribute to this by creating a “Neighbourhood Development Plan” which will be used to define site specific allocations in more detail than the Four Towns Plan, as well as any specific requirements (e.g. style/materials) where appropriate to the neighbourhood. If we don’t create a plan then we will have no say in our future and how the Parish develops over the next 10, 20 and 30 years.

98 households returned a questionnaire (44% of the 222 households in the Parish). Although a lower response rate than previous appraisals, this level is sufficient to be considered as representative of the community and its wishes. Response rates by settlement varied significantly:

Caldecott	62%	13 responses from 21 households
Chelston Rise	28%	14 responses from 50 households
Chelveston	46%	69 responses from 151 households
Unspecified	1%	2 responses

The lower response rates in Chelston Rise do reflect the fact that several properties are let on a short term basis, with tenants perhaps having a smaller stake in the longer term future of the community.

2. How should Chelveston-cum-Caldecott develop?

The Parish has expanded by 15% in the last 20 years and 50% over the last 50 years. What development do you think should be permitted over the next 10, 20 and 30 years?

From 98 responses		Years from now		
Q1 Thinking first about Chelveston which currently has 151 houses		10	20	30
No further development should be permitted.....		30	24	23
Up to a 10% expansion should be permitted (up 15 more houses).....		34	29	20
Up to a 20% expansion should be permitted (up to 30 more houses)		6	20	13
Up to a 50% expansion should be permitted (up to 75 more houses)		3	5	9
A 100% or greater expansion should be permitted (150+ more houses)		0	0	5
No opinion		25	20	28
Q2 Thinking now about Caldecott which currently has 21 houses		10	20	30
No further development should be permitted.....		37	27	29
Up to a 10% expansion should be permitted (up 2 more houses)		19	19	14
Up to a 20% expansion should be permitted (up to 4 more houses)		11	12	8
Up to a 50% expansion should be permitted (up to 10 more houses)		5	15	10
Up to a 100% or greater expansion should be permitted (20+ more houses)		3	5	8
No opinion		23	20	29
Q3 Thinking now about Chelston Rise which currently has 50 houses		10	20	30
No further development should be permitted.....		29	26	27
Up to a 10% expansion should be permitted (up 5 more houses).....		18	14	13
Up to a 20% expansion should be permitted (up to 10 more houses)		23	15	9
Up to a 50% expansion should be permitted (up to 25 more houses)		7	15	10
Up to a 100% or greater expansion should be permitted (50+ more houses)		3	3	10
No opinion		18	25	29

Commentary on responses to Q1-3

No Development Wanted: In 1995 (the last local plan) 76 households felt that no new development was actually needed and 42 households from Chelveston and Caldecott actively opposed all development in the Parish (26% of all households at the time). There was broader support for limited in-fill development but only 5 households were prepared to accept anything more than small groups of in-fill housing.

In the 2012 survey, 30 households expressed opposition to all development in Chelveston and 37 households expressed opposition to all development in Caldecott over the next 10 years. 29 households opposed all further development of Chelston Rise. Even taking into account the lower response rate, this represents a 12% decrease since 1995 in the proportion of all households objecting to any development.

Through post code analysis, we were able to look at responses by community to development in each of the three areas. 6 out of 13 responses from households Caldecott oppose all development in Caldecott. 6 out 14 responses from households in Chelston Rise oppose all development at Chelston Rise. Perhaps more surprising is that 25 Chelveston households oppose development in Caldecott and 23 of these also oppose development at Chelston Rise over the next 10-years. Opposition to development over a longer timescale of 20 or 30 years falls by a few percentage points but not by as much as might have been expected.

There is clearly a core of residents in the Parish who are very happy with the Village as it is and who have no desire to see it change. Indeed some have commented that they originally moved to the Village because it was the size it was and because it had limited scope for development. Most of the residents who expressed this opinion in 1995 still live in the Village and, unsurprisingly, many of these (but not all) still hold the same views.

Support for Chelveston Development: 43 households in the survey would be prepared to see a modest expansion in Chelveston (up to 15 houses) over the next 10-years and 25 households would be prepared to see a larger expansion of up to 30 houses over a 20-year period. There is limited support (14 households) for a larger expansion if the time horizon is pushed out to 30 years.

Support for Caldecott Development: Over a 10-year horizon, 38 households would be prepared to see 2 additional new houses developed in Caldecott (in addition to the four dwellings already approved at Duchy Farm). However, only 19 households would be happy to accept a development of up to 4 additional houses in 10 years. Only 2 of these supporters are based in Caldecott. Support for any more than 4 new houses in Caldecott over a 10-year period is very limited (8 households – with none from Caldecott). Pushing the time horizon out to 20 years sees support from 32 households for a total of 4 new properties and 20 households for up to 10 new properties. There is little support for more development even over 30 years.

Support for Chelston Rise Development: Over a 10-year period, 49 households were prepared to see a modest expansion of 5 houses in Chelston Rise and 31 households would accept up to 10 more houses. Only 8 households would be prepared to support the expansion of Chelston Rise by 25 houses within 10-years. The landlord's current proposal to more than double the size of Chelston Rise received only three votes of support 1 from Chelveston and 2 from Chelston Rise. Over a 20 period, 33 households supported up to 10 additional properties at Chelston Rise development. This figure holds steady even over a 30 year time horizon. Support for larger scale development is limited to 18-20 households over 20-30 years.

Conclusions which might be drawn from responses to Q1-3

Whilst there is still a core of opposition to any form of development in the Village, this opposition now represents a minority of respondents. Taking into account all households, not just those responding, 13% of the Village opposes all forms of development of the Village over the next 10 years. 11% opposes all development over a 20-year time horizon.

Given these figures, it is clear that a majority of respondents might be prepared to accept limited development of the 3 settlements over the next 10 years (up to 10% growth). Over 20 years there is minority support for up to 20% development but little support for more than this, even over a 30 year horizon.

	10 years	20 years	30 years
Chelveston	15 more houses	15 more	No more
Caldecott	2 more	2 more	No more
Chelston Rise	5 more	5 more	No more

3. Where should Chelveston-cum-Caldecott develop?

The National Planning Policy Framework shows a preference for using previously developed land (brown field sites) before undeveloped land (green field). Please list any areas of previously developed land in the village where development should be permitted over the next 30 years?

Q4	Considering first Chelveston	Responses
a.	JST Forklift Site – Area “A” on the map	37
Q5	Considering now Caldecott and Chelston Rise	
a.	Barn site and yard opposite Duchy Farm on Bidwell Lane – Area “E” on the Map	9
b.	Old hospital site opposite Chelston Rise	6
c.	Barn conversions at Poplar Farm, Manor Farm	5
d.	Chelston Rise school site	3
e.	Carr Haulage yard	2

The village boundaries have been very tightly defined for the last 20+ years, restricting development to a small number of defined “in-fill” locations. These have all now been developed. After looking at the attached maps, please list below any green field locations in which you feel new housing could sensibly be accommodated.

Q6	Considering first Chelveston	Responses
a.	Along north side of Sawyers Crescent up to “Meadowview” – Area “B” on the map	34
b.	Duchy Field south west of Duchy Close – Area “C”	17
c.	East side of Raunds Road, north of Britten Close – Area “D” on the map	9
d.	Fields on Kimbolton Road opposite lay-by	2
e.	Field behind 31-35 Water Lane	2
f.	Plots along Water Lane opposite existing houses	2
g.	Raunds Road beyond Pretoria Cottage	1
h.	Half of pub field and half of allotment field	1
Q7	Considering now Caldecott	Responses
a.	From “Church House” around Bidwell Corner opposite “Manor Farm” – Area “F” on map	20
b.	Opposite Village Hall from B645 to Bidwell Turn	4
c.	In-fill between Manor Farm and Poplar Farm	3
d.	Bidwell Lane	2
e.	In the field behind the church	1
f.	Land to south of Duchy Farm	1
g.	Opposite the “Marches”	1
h.	Between the “Woodlands” and Village Hall	1
Q8	Considering now Chelston Rise	Responses
a.	Land to north west of existing housing but within perimeter fence – Area “G” on the map	15
b.	Join Caldecott to Chelston Rise	7
c.	Land to East of Chelston Rise	4
d.	Garrett Spinney	3
e.	On children’s play area in the centre	1

Commentary on responses to Q4-5 – Previously Developed Land Re-use

Chelveston: There is clear support amongst respondents (and more widely) for the redevelopment of the JST industrial site opposite the War Memorial (Area “A”). The support for using this site for housing even extended to some of the respondents who had previously expressed their objection to *any* development in Q1-3. There were a number of comments that it was now inappropriate for such an industrial site to be located on the main road in the centre of the Village, given the traffic problems it causes. Depending on the type of housing and the density, this site might accommodate 10-12 properties.

Caldecott: There was significant support for further conversions of existing farm buildings. In particular the site opposite Duchy Farm was highlighted (Area “E”). Duchy Farm is being sold by the Duchy of Lancaster for redevelopment as 4 properties (planning permission granted). However, the barn and farm yard opposite is still being used by the original tenants for agricultural purposes. Developing this site might

enhance the aspect of the Duchy Farm conversions and the existing Duchy Farm Cottages and minimise damage to the road caused by agricultural machinery. Retaining this yard and its buildings in the long term does not seem sensible given the relocation of the main business from Duchy Farm. This site might certainly accommodate 2-3 properties, perhaps more depending on what proportion of the yard is deemed to be previously developed. There might be a similar level of support for other sensitive barn conversions at Manor Farm and Poplar Farm, each offering the potential for 1 property. There is only limited support for the redevelopment of the Carr Brothers haulage yard.

Commentary on responses to Q6-8 – Green Field Development

Chelveston: 34 respondents identified the field to the north of Sawyers Crescent up to “Meadowview” (Area “B”) on the Raunds Road as being the preferred site for any green field development, with “ribbon in-fill” the preferred design. Within Chelveston, this is a clear gap in the lay out of the Village, separating the rest of the Raunds Road housing from the heart of the Village.

However, there could be some challenges in developing this field for housing. It is crossed diagonally by an important and well used public footpath and is also bounded by Sawyers Crescent. St. Georges Row and Sawyers Crescent are currently a high speed “rat run” from Rushden to Raunds. There is severe shortage of parking spaces all the way along this road, with the St. Georges Row end in particular suffering from on pavement parking. Two-way traffic is rarely possible and there are particular problems for refuse vehicles and delivery vehicles. Vans parked along Sawyers Crescent currently need to be parked partly on the pavement with wing mirrors withdrawn to allow other vehicles through.

The field bordering Sawyers Crescent once had outline planning permission for ribbon development but this was allowed to lapse. A further application for 5 starter homes and 1 detached residence was then declined on resubmission (89/00005/OUT). At the time this proposed ribbon development along Sawyers Crescent was opposed by residents for reasons outlined above, and so it would be important for the poor design of this road to be resolved as part of the development of this site.

Depending on design this site might accommodate 5 low level properties (bungalows or low dormer styles houses) as a ribbon development on Raunds Road from “Meadowview” down almost to the end of Sawyers Crescent using the Raunds Road for access. Low level properties would be in keeping with the next 4 properties further up the Raunds Road and would minimise the visual impact on numbers 2-8 Raunds Road on the opposite side. A 2-storey property might be sited on the foot print of the barn at the junction of St. Georges Row and Sawyers Crescent using the farm entrance for access. Development of a frontage along Sawyers Crescent itself might impact on the visual amenity enjoyed by properties on Sawyers Crescent who currently have an open aspect with views over the fields. Careful design would be necessary to minimise this potential impact.

17 respondents also identified Duchy Field (Area “C”) as a possible site for green field development with 2 others adding the adjoining fields behind 31-35 Water Lane. This site was proposed for development in 1993/1994 and at the time faced significant opposition as the access was proposed to be from Duchy Close. Some respondents in 2012 suggested that access should be by means of a new roundabout at the Caldecott Road junction on the B645, with the added benefit that this would calm traffic down the hill into the centre of the Village. This is a very large site which might easily accommodate 60-80 houses at moderate density and over 100 at high density. However, some respondents suggested that this site should also include a large village green and children’s playground, with another suggesting a nursery and shop too.

There was some limited support (9 respondents) for developing the east side of the Raunds Road from Hawthorn Cottage up to opposite Pretoria Cottages (Area “D”). This is a large site with the potential for 20 houses in a ribbon development a medium density.

Caldecott: 20 respondents suggested that the field in Caldecott adjacent to Church House and stretching down to Bidwell corner and around into Bidwell Lane (Area “F”) might be a suitable site for a ribbon green field development. This site might easily accommodate 5 or 6 detached houses at low density. Given the proximity to the listed buildings at Manor Farm, Duchy Farm and the Church, these would need to be high quality, stone built developments to be in keeping with the character of Caldecott. There is the potential for this site to link with the Duchy Farm barns site, identified above as previously developed land, which might be suitable for redevelopment.

Chelston Rise: The playing fields to the north west of the housing at Chelston Rise (Area “G”) were suggested by 15 respondents. This is a large site and the owners have outlined a scheme which could hold 69 properties at medium to high density. Maintaining the existing density and style could see 10-15 properties accommodated on that land.

7 respondents suggested joining Chelston Rise to Caldecott in a ribbon development to improve the integration of the two communities and provide a footway between them as part of this development.

Conclusions which might be drawn from Q4-8 – Development locations

Chelveston: From Q1-3 there is support for the development of up to 15 houses over the next 10-years and potentially a further 15 in the following 10 years. The redevelopment of JST (10-12 units) and green field development of the land to the north of Sawyers Crescent (6 units) would more than deliver the level of expansion that has clear support for the first 10 years of the plan.

Beyond the 10-year horizon, opening Duchy Field for development would create the potential for increasing the size of the Village by another 50-60%, much more than there is clear support for. Once ear-marked for any development it would be very difficult to resist this field reaching its full potential of 100+ houses unless a large village green was incorporated in the centre to protect the outlook from Duchy Close. This would force housing to be accommodated around the outside, arranged around the green. 20-30 medium-large properties might then be possible and such an expansion might find support over a 20-year horizon.

Caldecott: The redevelopment of the barn site opposite “Duchy Farm” might accommodate 2-3 good sized properties, the number of properties for which there is clear support, over a 10-year horizon.

Over a 20-year horizon, there was support for green field development between “Church House” on the Caldecott Road and round the corner of Bidwell Lane. There was more support for this than for additional barn conversions or the re-development of Carr Brothers haulage yard. However with the potential for 5-6 properties, this would exceed the 20-year level of development for which there is support.

Chelston Rise: There is clear support for limited development of the land to the north west of Chelston Rise within the perimeter fence. Great concern was expressed by respondents that the character settlement could easily be “overwhelmed” if the full potential of the site was realised. The existing site is open plan and low-medium density, suiting the character of the landscape well. The large open spaces are well suited to what is predominantly family housing. There is support for phased expansion by 10 houses over a 20 year period, preferably designed to preserve the same overall character of the site. There is a potential issue with a 1 acre plot of land on the north western boundary of the plot, which is owned separately and is subject to a planning application for the temporary siting of caravans. This might not suit the area and might be unlikely to find support from any part of the village.

If all of these expansions came to pass over a 20-year time horizon the Parish would see a 20% expansion. This would need to be carefully planned to avoid altering the character of the Village significantly.

4. Future Housing Needs

East Northamptonshire Council has a statutory duty to assess the need for housing in all rural wards and has asked the Parish Council to include questions about future housing requirements in this survey. This information is useful when considering planning applications as it provides an indication of what type of housing is needed in the village.

Q9	What is your current housing situation?	Responses
a.	Owner occupier - with mortgage	38
b.	Owner occupier - no mortgage	52
c.	Private renting	5
d.	Housing association renting	2
e.	Living with parents	0
f.	Accommodation tied to employment	0
g.	Other/not specified	1

Q10	What type of property do you live in?	Responses
a.	House	90
b.	Bungalow	7
c.	Flat/apartment	0
d.	Mobile home	0
e.	Not specified	1
Q11	How many bedrooms does your home have?	Responses
a.	1	0
b.	2	14
c.	3	47
d.	4	24
e.	5+	13
Q12	How long have you lived in the parish?	Responses
a.	15 years +	44
b.	10 - 15 years	10
c.	5 - 9 years	17
d.	1 - 4 years	22
e.	less than 1 year	5
Q13	Please indicate below if anyone in your household have a disability or health problem that would be improved by moving home?	Responses
a.	Not applicable	90
b.	Mobility difficulties	3
c.	Visual impairment	0
d.	Hearing impairment	2
e.	Learning difficulties	0
f.	Mental health concerns	1
g.	Long standing illness	0
h.	Other	1
Q14	Are you (or any family member currently living with you) registered on a housing waiting list?	Responses
a.	Local Authority Housing Register	0
b.	Housing Association Register	0
c.	Both of the above	0
d.	None of the above	97
Q15	Are you or anyone in your household likely to be looking for alternative accommodation either now or in the next 5 years?	Responses
a.	Yes	18
b.	No	79
Q16	How soon would you/they like to move?	Responses
a.	Immediately	1
b.	Within the next 2 years	3
c.	Between 2 - 5 years	12
Q17	Please tell us why you/they would like alternative accommodation	Responses
a.	Need larger accommodation	0
b.	Need independent accommodation	3
c.	Need to be closer to employment	1
d.	Need to be closer to carer/dependent	0
e.	Need to move to sheltered housing	2
f.	Need physically adapted property or property designed to disability standards	1
g.	Need smaller accommodation	3
h.	Need first home	3
i.	Need cheaper home	1
j.	Need security of tenure	1
Q18	What type of alternative accommodation is required	Responses
a.	Detached house	7
b.	Semi-detached house	4
c.	Terraced house	3
d.	Bungalow	1
e.	Flat/Maisonette	3
f.	Sheltered accommodation	2

Q19	How many bedrooms are needed	Responses
a.	1 Bedroom	1
b.	2 Bedrooms	7
c.	3 bedrooms	5
d.	4 Bedrooms	2
Q20	What type of occupancy is required?	Responses
a.	Owner occupied	9
b.	Privately rented	4
c.	Housing association	4
d.	Shared ownership	0
Q21	If they are looking to buy a property please indicate in what price range	Responses
a.	Not applicable	5
b.	£125,000 - £149,999	4
c.	£150,000 - £174,999	1
d.	£175,000 - £199,000	0
e.	£200,000 - £249,000	0
f.	£250,000 - £299,000	1
g.	£300,000 - £349,000	1
h.	Over £350,000	1
Q22	If you/they are looking to rent please indicate what range of rent per calendar month is required	Responses
a.	Not applicable	7
b.	£350 - £399	3
c.	£400 - £449	3
d.	£450 - £499	0
e.	£500 - £549	0
f.	£550 - £599	0
g.	£600 - £649	0
h.	£650 - £699	0
i.	£700 - £749	0
j.	£750+	0
Q23	In your opinion what types of new homes are needed in the parish? (Select all that apply)	Responses
a.	Detached houses	36
b.	Semi-detached houses	40
c.	Terraced houses	21
d.	Bungalows	24
e.	Flats/maisonettes	4
f.	Sheltered accommodation	7
g.	Retirement homes	10
h.	None are needed	31
	Other (please specify below)	2
i.	Mixed housing and affordable homes	1
j.	Housing for young people	1
Q24	What type of occupancy is needed?	Responses
a.	Owner occupied	58
b.	Privately rented	16
c.	Housing association	17
d.	Shared ownership	10
e.	None is needed	31
Q25	Do you know of anyone who has had to leave the parish in the last 5 years through lack of suitable or affordable housing?	Responses
a.	Yes (Please tell us how many people below)	7
b.	No	89
	Details	
c.	2 households	2
d.	5 households have left	1
e.	1 person in teens/early twenties	1

Commentary on responses to Q9-25 – Future Housing Needs

These questions were included on behalf of East Northamptonshire Council to fulfil their duty to assess rural housing needs.

Q9 and 14 clearly reveals the nature of the respondents to the survey. Over 90% of respondents were home owners rather than tenants, presumably therefore with a significant financial stake in the future development of the Village. Over 50% of these respondents have no mortgage, probably indicating that they are longer term or older residents. This is clearly supported by Q12 which shows that the majority of respondents have indeed lived in the Village for more than 10 years.

Q15-17 indicate that the majority of respondents plan to stay in the Village for at least 5 years, albeit with some members of their households either moving out into independent accommodation or sheltered housing. Those leaving were evenly split between buying and renting their future house with equal demand for lower cost purchases and lower cost rental properties.

From Q18-20, a mixed type housing stock appears to be preferred with 60% of respondents favouring owner occupied and 40% favouring rented, or shared ownership properties. Written comments covered the fact that this was an expensive village with little availability of housing for young people. Some of the comments pointed out that incoming young families are necessary to renew and maintain a community.

Conclusions which might be drawn from Q9-25 – Future Housing Needs

These responses certainly mirrored those of earlier surveys which have suggested that mixed new housing stock is needed across the Village to enable young families to move in and stay. Historically, the houses in Duchy Close fulfilled this role with a steady turn-over of young couples moving in and raising families. However, this trend has fallen off in the last 15 years. The increase in house prices, particularly for detached houses, has effectively priced young people out of Chelveston. The rapid uptake of the houses in Chelston Rise demonstrated a clear demand for mixed-stock family housing.

4. Community Facilities

50 years ago the (smaller) Village had more community facilities – a school, a pub and working men's club, two places of worship, the Village Institute in the centre of Chelveston, a petrol station, shop and off licence. Today we have the pub, the Parish Church, the Village Hall between Caldecott and Chelveston, the allotments and the Chelston Rise play area.

Q26 What are your views on local facilities for the following age groups?

	Very Good	Good	Neither Good nor Poor	Poor	Very Poor	Don't know
Under 5s	1	13	13	18	19	19
5 - 10 year olds	0	8	17	20	24	18
11 - 16 year olds	0	2	15	27	27	15
17 - 25 year olds	1	8	32	14	21	10
26 - 59 year olds	3	22	35	8	13	5
Over 60s	2	22	27	15	10	10

If you selected poor or very poor please tell us why

	Responses
a. No organised activities or facilities for 11-16 year olds	12
b. No play area or sports field in Chelveston	10
c. No shop or café	8
d. No bus service	5

Q27 Which (if any) of the following would you like to see in the parish? select any that apply)	Responses
a. Footpath between Water Lane and Bidwell Lane	52
b. Footpath between Caldecott and Chelston Rise	42
c. Play area in Chelveston Village	41
d. Sports/Recreation field	40
e. More play equipment for over 10s	25
f. Community hall/Meeting place in Chelveston	13
g. Community hall/Meeting place in Chelston Rise	6
Other (Please specify below)	
h. Village shop	5
i. Bus route	4
j. Cycle/foot paths to Higham Ferrers and Raunds	3
k. Footpath from Caldecott Road around to the B645 end of Water Lane	2
l. Skate park	1
n. Basketball court at Chelston Rise	1
o. Village pond	1

Q28 We currently have 16 allotments, would you like an allotment if additional plots were available?	Responses
a. Yes	11
b. No	82

Q29 The churchyard is running short of space. Do you think Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Parish Council should provide a new cemetery?	Responses
a. Yes	54
b. No	16
c. Don't know	28

Q30 If you answered yes above please tell us where you think a new cemetery could be located.	Responses
a. Adjacent to the existing cemetery (either side or behind)	43
b. Opposite church or elsewhere in Caldecott	4
c. Behind the Village Hall	3

Commentary on responses to Q26-30 – Community Facilities

From responses to Q26, there is clearly a measure of dissatisfaction with the community facilities currently available for young people in the Village. The play area at Chelston Rise is the only facility targeted at this section of the community and this is inaccessible to children from Chelveston and Caldecott unless transport is available to them. This is also reflected in Q27 which shows demand from nearly 40% of respondents each for a play area (with equipment) and a sports/recreation field.

There was clear support from over half of respondents for the footpath from the end of Water Lane to Bidwell to be completed. In the 1990s this footpath was commissioned by the Parish Council but was never completed after the County Council ran out of money. There was also strong support for a path between Caldecott and Chelston Rise.

In Q27 only 5 respondents identified a village shop as desirable but later, in Q35, 54 respondents suggested that they would like to see a general store/café/post office in or nearer the village.

Q29 shows clear support from over half of the respondents for the provision of additional cemetery space by the Parish Council once the existing churchyard is full. From Q30, the clear direction is that the new cemetery space should be an extension of the existing churchyard.

Conclusions which might be drawn from Q26-30 – Community Facilities

The concern over the absence of play facilities for children mirrors the responses from previous surveys. It had been hoped that the availability of facilities at Chelston Rise might be a partial solution to this problem, but there is no evidence that families from Chelveston or Caldecott are prepared to travel to Chelston Rise in order to use the play area.

The provision of a sports field and associated play equipment would be a substantial investment (tens of thousands of pounds) with annual running costs (grass cutting and equipment maintenance) of several hundred pounds. It is unlikely that the Parish Council would be able to afford such an investment with the existing level of council tax. However, grants are available for the provision of sports facilities if there is clear evidence of local demand and support. To secure these grants, it is usually necessary for there to be significant community involvement in the process.

The existing 16 allotments have been a popular amenity and have enjoyed support from the wider community. Q28 suggested that several additional allotment plots might needed, but this is not currently borne out by the small waiting list held by the Chelveston Allotment Association.

Previous surveys have identified the importance of public rights of way and footpaths around the village. The Parish Council has therefore always given high priority to ensuring that the footpath and rights of way network is developed and well maintained. The re-opening of paths across the old airfield has been a major improvement since the last local plan in 1995. However, it is very clear from this survey that more needs to be done to push for the extension of the path from Water Lane to Bidwell and to exploring options for a path between Caldecott and Chelston Rise.

The support for the possible extension of the churchyard is also an important finding from the survey. This needs long term planning and the clear support for this from residents is an important first step.

5. Shopping, Services and other Amenities

Q31 Where does your household go for the Bulk of your grocery shopping?		Responses
a.	Rushden (incl LIDL & Waitrose)	59
b.	Wellingborough	26
c.	Raunds	3
d.	Internet	3
e.	Lancaster Farm shop	1
f.	Kettering	1
g.	Higham Ferrers	0
h.	Kimbolton	0

Q32 Which of the following local shops/services does your household use more than once a month				
Star & Garter	33	Stanwick pub/working mens club	4	Rushden Tesco Express 8
Lancaster Farm Shop	17	Stanwick butchers	19	Rushden Waitrose 65
Kimbolton Independent shops	2	Stanwick post office/shop/café	32	Rushden pubs/clubs 5
Raunds Co-op (Food & Groceries)	61	Higham pubs/working men's club	1	Rushden restaurants, cafes, takeaways 11
Raunds restaurants, cafes, takeaways	24	Higham restaurants, cafes, takeaways	15	Rushden shops/hairdressers 19
Raunds BP Garage, shop, café (24 hr)	32	Higham Co-op	16	Rushden banks, building societies 47
Raunds market (Fridays)	6	Higham farmers market	10	Wellingborough supermarkets 41
Raunds shops, hairdressers bank etc.	10	Higham shops/hairdressers	21	Wellingborough banks, shops, hairdressers 3
Raunds post office	24	Rushden ASDA	44	Kettering shops, supermarkets 3
Raunds newsagent	22	Rushden LIDL	34	Bedford supermarkets 1

Q33 How often would you use a corner shop/general store located in the village?		Responses
a.	Daily	14
b.	Weekly	45
c.	Occasional/emergency purchases only	33
d.	Never	4

Q34 Where in the village do you think a shop/store might be located?		Responses
a.	In or behind the pub or in the cottage next door	31
b.	Water Lane, in the old post office location (by post box) or on sloping green opposite	14
c.	As part of the JST development	10
d.	Somewhere central in Chelveston	9
e.	In Gracey's Offices	6
f.	Chelston Rise	4
g.	In Duchy Field as part of housing development	3
h.	On the Raunds Road	3
Q35 Please list any kinds of shops/services you would like to see more of in, or		Responses
Q36 near, the parish and any other amenities needed or issues you wish to raise		
a.	General store including newsagent and post office	54
b.	Traffic calming (various detailed below)	14
b.	Bus services	10
c.	Café or coffee shop for socialising	8
d.	Improved cycle routes	6
e.	Petrol station	3
f.	Improved play areas/sports facilities	4
g.	Banking facilities	2
h.	No more airfield development	2
i.	School bus from Chelston Rise to Higham	1
j.	Social club/youth club	1
k.	Nursery/lower school	1
l.	Ban the awful recorded church bells on Sunday morning	1

Commentary on responses to Q31-36 – Shopping, Services and other amenities

Q31 and 32 showed that the majority of routine shopping and services are sourced relatively locally. The majority of grocery shopping is undertaken in Rushden and Higham Ferrers (depending on where LIDL and Waitrose are considered to be located). This reflects the fact that there are three major supermarkets within a 1 mile radius servicing all price points in the market. Wellingborough (presumably Tesco) services the next largest group. The Raunds Co-op (but not Higham) then appears to be used regularly for “top-up” shopping. Indeed in general, Raunds and Stanwick services seem to be used much more than those in Higham Ferrers in spite of the traditionally stronger link between the village and Higham Ferrers. This may simply reflect the better parking facilities in Raunds at the Co-op, on the street and in the square.

Over 50% of respondents would like to see a village shop or convenience store in the village offering a range of services – groceries, newsagent and post office. However, only 14 respondents would use such a facility on a daily basis, with another 45 perhaps weekly. Many respondents recognised that this would not be sufficient to sustain a shop and suggested co-location with the pub, both to keep costs down and to be sufficiently central to attract passing trade.

In the detailed comments of Q36 traffic calming and parking were raised as major issues. Comments were made on the need for a 7.5 tonne limit through Caldecott and the need for enforcing the 7.5 tonne limit on the Raunds Road. Speeding was raised several times. Reducing Water Lane to 20mph with traffic calming measures near the ford was suggested. So too was making Sawyers Crescent one-way, to avoid “rat running”. Speeding on Raunds Road/High Street is clearly a problem, especially at the bend by Pokas Cottages given the parking there. Indeed it was suggested that High Street should have double yellow lines to improve safety and that these should extend to the shared driveway by Middle Farm House on The Green. Preventing parking by the post box in Chelveston was also suggested to make the sharp turn to Raunds easier. The need to move the JST business was re-iterated strongly by 2 respondents, both to alleviate the traffic problems it causes (with HGVs) and to improve the feel of the site.

Footpaths and cycleways were raised as issues, with a particular need to keep the path next to the ford on Water Lane clear and to focus on linking the three settlements. Dog bins should be provided near all major paths and residents should be encouraged to use them.

Conclusions which might be drawn from Q31-36 – Shopping, Services and other amenities

Village shops can be very hard to sustain in a community with a population of less than 2,000 unless there are other supporting factors. These might be a high volume of passing traffic (with convenient parking) or other attractors such as a nearby school. These criteria are met both in Stanwick and Higham Ferrers and this has led to the establishment of thriving general store/post office businesses. It is highly unlikely that

these conditions could be met in Chelveston-cum-Caldecott, particularly as there is already a daily delivery service for newspapers and dairy items.

A request for bus services was highlighted in several responses. Many such services have been established in the past and have not been well used. The relatively new "County Connect" service has been established to provide a "booked" service to nearby connection towns. Leaflets have been delivered to all households to publicise this.

Traffic calming is clearly still a major issue as has been picked up on previous surveys. Caldecott has been the recent priority for the Parish Council given the increased traffic volumes for Chelston Rise and to the old airfield. However, it is clear that Water Lane/Sawyers Crescent need to be tackled, together with High Street and the B663/B645 junction.

6. Demographics and Distribution of Respondents

Q37 What is your post code	Responses
a. NN9 6AB – Raunds Road	10
b. NN9 6AD – Sawyers Crescent	4
c. NN9 6AE – St Georges Row	4
d. NN9 6AF – Water Lane (35-47)	4
e. NN9 6AG – Water Lane (Scaraben-Hall Farm House)	1
f. NN9 6AH – Higham Road	1
g. NN9 6AJ – The Green	3
h. NN9 6AL – Pokas Cottages	1
i. NN9 6AN – Kimbolton Road	1
j. NN9 6AP – Water Lane (1-Hill House)	5
k. NN9 6AQ – Hillside	3
l. NN9 6AR – Caldecott	11
m. NN9 6AS – High Street	2
n. NN9 6AT – Caldecott (Church House, Woodland, Old Vicarage, School House)	2
o. NN9 6AU – Chelston Rise	14
p. NN9 6AW – Duchy Close	16
q. NN9 6AX – Foot Lane	4
r. NN9 6AY – Britten Close	4
s. NN9 6RA – Disbrowe Court	4

Q38 How old are you?	Responses
a. 16 - 24	0
b. 25 - 34	5
c. 35 - 44	18
d. 45 - 59	33
e. 60 - 75	22
f. 75+	6
g. Prefer not to say	14

Commentary on responses to Q37-38 – Demographics and Distribution

There is little to be gained by a detailed analysis of this data other than to say that it clearly confirms earlier insights that a large majority of respondents are probably "established" residents who have lived in the Village many years and who have responded to previous surveys. However, when formulating the Neighbourhood Development Plan it is important that opinion is canvassed from as wide a group as possible, as the plan must be put to a referendum of the whole Village before it can be adopted.

6. Conclusions and Next Steps

This report will be presented to residents at the Annual Parish Assembly on 29th April 2013 and a copy will be distributed to all households in the Parish. A working party of interested residents will then be formed to prepare the detailed Neighbourhood Development Plan.





