



**From:** [Adrian Dale](#)  
**To:** ["Pieter Mommersteeg": chair@ndp.chelveston.org.uk](mailto:chair@ndp.chelveston.org.uk)  
**Subject:** NDP-0142-Filenote-Meeting-2013-11-07-Published-Version  
**Date:** 08 December 2013 21:42:18

---

**Present:** **Adrian Dale**  
**Pieter Mommersteeg**  
**Andrew Seaman**

**Location:** **Church House Caldecott**

**Agenda:**

1. **Reviewing the Policy Constraints which the NDP must take into account**
2. **Brainstorming the "vision" section of the NDP**

### **1. Policy Constraints**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF [NDP-0141](#)) lays down how the NDP must be formulated. To be seen as sound our NDP must demonstrate alignment with the key policy guidelines in this framework. It should also fit with the Core Spatial Strategy – 2008 (CSS [NDP-0037](#)) but realistically as this pre-dates the NPPF we must give preference to the NPPF in our compliance. If we deviate from the NPPF, then we must explain why and show evidence to justify it. There is currently no Local Plan for the District but there are some saved policies which apply to our Parish (ENC Saved Policies – [NDP-0114](#)) These potentially do have an impact for us as they impose requirements on housing developments of more than 10 houses.

We discussed the broad principles and ARD agreed to pick out the key parts of the NPPF which *probably* apply to our NDP. These are set out in the [NDP-0150](#). Other interpretations are of course possible . . . .

We also discussed the question of housing density as the CSS suggests a minimum density of 30 houses per hectare. This seems very high in our context so ARD did an analysis of the Parish (see [NDP-0148](#)) These figures contributed to the brainstorm of visions

### **2. Brainstorming a Vision for the Parish**

We explored the characteristics of the Parish and proposed the following points for consideration as part of the vision. These need to be debated and refined by the working party and with residents.

1. Overall Chelveston-cum-Caldecott is a desirable place to live. Estate agents variously describe it as "popular and convenient" or "sought after". Property rarely comes onto the market in Chelveston and is usually priced at a 15-20% premium over nearby towns.
2. Chelveston-cum-Caldecott would be best described as "semi-rural". It is only 2 miles from Raunds and Higham Ferrers and has several "through" routes. It is therefore different in character from places like Hargrave or Dean/Shelton which are off the main roads and hence more isolated.
3. "Well connected" is one of the key characteristics of the Village. Provided that residents have cars, it is very easy to get to all the local facilities. With the possible exception of Stanwick, we are one of the best connected Villages in the District.
4. However, although well connected, it is the clear separation from Raunds, Higham and

- Stanwick which is an important feature of the Parish and something to be preserved. This is especially the case given the aspirations of the Rushden Urban Extension and the Duchy of Lancaster's aspirations for Higham. These would shrink the "green belt" around the Parish.
5. The farm land around the Village is an asset and valuable amenity as the fields are crossed by an excellent rights of way network. Again we can emphasise the connectivity of this network – with paths to Stanwick, Higham, Rushden, Yelden, Dean and Shelton, giving access to the Three Shires Way.
  6. The approach to the Village from all directions is attractive – the settlements are well defined by the local landscape – particularly when approaching Caldecott and Chelveston, both approached by descent from Higham/Raunds/Newton Bromswold and also from Kimbolton/Hargrave. The "Look and feel" of these approaches is probably worth preserving.
  7. Chelston Rise is approached around bends, revealing the settlement at the last minute and so also occupies a distinctive place in the landscape.
  8. There are three distinct settlements, each with a distinct character. Although there is some integration more integration of the communities would probably be desirable. However, there is no desire to physically merge the three settlements.
  9. Although there is an argument to support a footway between Chelston Rise and Caldecott as an aid to integration, it is questionable how many people would use it. If visiting the Village Hall, most people would drive, especially at night or with children. Similarly, it is unlikely that people would walk the 1.5 miles to the pub. Most would drive.
  10. Connecting Chelston Rise to Caldecott with an off-road permissive path behind a hedge might be attractive to create an off road circular country walk, further enhancing the network of paths in the Village. This would be used by dog walkers and ramblers.
  11. The variety of housing is an attractive feature of the Parish and it was acknowledged that we should seek to ensure that we don't have large developments of similar bland housing stock. The developments of the 1960s and 1980s were not the best examples of design. On all the "through" routes, we need to ensure that development is of high quality to enhance the built environment. This is particularly true in the centre of Chelveston near the memorial and in Caldecott. In Chelston Rise, there is a distinctive character which provides a link back to the American use of the base. Many of the current residents moved onto the estate because of the open, American suburban feel to the site. This character is probably worth preserving by complementary design.
  12. To preserve the character and "feel" of Chelveston/Caldecott/Chelston Rise we need to consider densities in the range of 15-22 houses/hectare. Moving to an average of 30 houses/hectare as recommended by the CSS would substantially change the overall character of the Parish.
  13. The pace of any developments need to be carefully phased so that new residents can be effectively integrated into the Village. The in-fill policy of the last 20 years has delivered a 15% expansion but without major disruption to the existing community.
  14. The leisure facilities offered by the pub, the golf club and the equestrian centre/livery are an asset and employment opportunity for young people.
  15. Whilst the JST site is clearly no longer an appropriate location for such a business, we support the integration of businesses within the village and the diversification of the farms to support businesses and provide employment opportunities. The Manor Farm workshops and the Poplar Farm Offices and Distribution Yard are established features of

Caldecott.

16. The management of traffic and parking need to be a priority. High speeds and increasing volumes of traffic on the through routes are detracting from the character of the Parish.

These points are just “starters for 10” and need debating – they are in no way an indication of policy nor an indication of an intent to create policy based upon them. They are not intended as a commentary on any of the aspirational sites submitted.

There are no strategic imperatives imposed on Chelveston-cum-Caldecott by the Core Spatial Strategy. For example, we are not required to accept a minimum number of houses or to create a certain number of jobs. However, equally, there is nothing in the Core Spatial Strategy which allows us to specify zero development. This would be seen to run counter to policy 14 in the NPPF.

Cllr Adrian Dale  
Chairman of the Parish Council  
Chelveston-cum-Caldecott

-----  
EMail: [Adrian.Dale@Creatifica.com](mailto:Adrian.Dale@Creatifica.com)

Tel: +44 1933 622624

Mobile: +44 7850 570007

Paper: Creatifica House, 21 Water Lane, Chelveston, Wellingborough, Northants, NN9 6AP, UK