

Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Neighbourhood Development Plan

Exhibition 14th/15 December 2013 Feedback

“An excellent informative exhibition”
Chelveston-cum-Caldecott resident

Section 1 – Introduction

On the weekend of the 14th and 15th of December 2013 an exhibition was held at Chelveston Village Hall to engage with residents and interested parties and to seek their views on the responses received to the call for Aspirational Sites questionnaire issued in October 2013, which forms part of the Neighbourhood development Plan (NDP).

All visitors to the exhibition were asked to complete a feedback form. Out of the one hundred and twenty-two (122) visitors, seventy-four (74) individuals completed the form, being 61% of all visitors. The questions on the form were designed to find out if the exhibition had succeeded in informing residents and interested parties of the NDP working party activities to date, what the NDP was for and how well the working party was communicating its activities. When analysing the data from the feedback forms all assessments have been made on the seventy-four (74) visitors who completed the forms and not on the one hundred and twenty-two (122) visitors who attended the exhibition.

The information gathered from the feedback forms shows clear evidence that individuals who completed the feedback form were fully informed on the progress of the NDP. They received this information from the aspirational development plans and background details on the display boards and in conversations with working party members. Individuals commented on the exhibition being clear, well set out and informative. Visitors to the exhibition were able to understand what an ‘aspirational site’ is and many considered that this understanding and knowledge had either strengthened or changed their views. The majority of visitors had heard of the NDP before attending the exhibition and having attended the exhibition they now felt encouraged to attend NDP meetings. All seventy-four (74) individuals who completed the feedback form gave their contact details so that they could be kept informed on future developments and meetings.

The evidence from the feedback forms does indicate that the NDP working party’s communication strategy is working. Although the overall number of visitors to the exhibition was disappointing, it should be noted that it was the second to last weekend to Christmas and this may have had an effect on numbers.

Section 2 – Information gathered from the feedback form data

Question 1 asked on a scale of 1-5, where 1 is not at all and 5 is a lot, how useful visitors found the exhibition (see table 1 for complete breakdown). The results from this question demonstrate that the exhibition was considered very useful by visitors, with sixty-two (62) visitors scoring 5 and ten (10) visitors scoring 4. Visitors were also asked to explain why they had found the exhibition useful or not useful. Most individuals chose not to explain their scoring for this question, however those that did complete this section said that it was helpful to see all the proposals together with supporting documents and verbal explanations (see Table 2 for complete list).

“Very useful maps and application documents supplemented by informative discussions”

Question 2 asked visitors if they understood what an ‘aspirational site’ was. Seventy-two (72) individuals said they did understand what an aspirational site was, one person said they did not and one individual did not answer the question, however under the ‘please explain’ part of the question they wrote ‘Garden dev’. Thirty (30) individuals who answered yes to question 2 added information on their understanding of an aspirational site (see List 1). From this information it can clearly be assumed that the exhibition was very successful in ensuring that visitors to the exhibition gained an understanding of what an ‘aspirational site’ is in terms of the NDP for the Parish.

“Hopes for development – development not guaranteed but considered on balance of other requests”

Question 3 asked visitors if they had been able to discover what aspirational developments had been proposed in their immediate location or road. All seventy-four (74) individuals who completed the feedback forms answered yes to this question, again demonstrating that the exhibition was clear and informative.

Question 4 asked visitors if they were aware of the NDP working party before receiving information on the exhibition. Thirteen (13) individuals said they were not aware and sixty-one (61) said they were aware of the NDP working party before receiving information on the exhibition. This indicates that the NDP working party had had some success in promoting the existence of the NDP before the exhibition.

Question 5 asked visitors if the exhibition had encouraged them to attend future NDP meetings. Only one (1) individual replied no to this stating it was because of ‘arms length independence’. Eleven (11) individuals said maybe and sixty-two (62) said yes it had encouraged them to attend future meetings. Out of the eleven (11) individuals who had replied **maybe** four (4) added information on their response and seventeen (17) out of the sixty-two (62) who replied **yes** added information on their response (see Lists 2 & 3). The responses from the **yes** group were

mainly concerned with individuals having a say on future developments and receiving information on developments.

“Interested in development and voicing our views”

Question 6 asked visitors if they had completed the 2012 Neighbourhood Development Questionnaire. The results were as follows:

- 53 x Yes
- 15 x No
- 6 x Don't know

Two individuals who answered no were not resident in the village in 2012.

Question 7 asked visitors if they answered yes to question 6 had the exhibition influenced their views in any way. Seven (7) individuals did not answer this question, thirteen (13) individuals said no with three of these giving a supporting statement and eight (8) individuals said yes with seven (7) of these giving a supporting statement. Twenty-five (25) individuals did not answer yes or no to question 7 but did give information under the 'please explain part of this question' (see lists 4, 5 & 6 for supporting information given). Overall ten (10) individuals said their view was unchanged and the rest of the explanations indicate an increase in knowledge of the 'aspirational sites' had either altered or strengthened individual's views.

Question 8 asked visitors if there was anything else they would like to tell The NDP Working Party and **Question 9** asked individuals if there was any additional information they needed about the Neighbourhood Development Planning process. Twenty-two (22) individuals responded to question 8 and two (2) individuals responded to question 9 (see lists 7 & 8).

Section 3 – Data from the feedback forms

Table 1

Question 1 asked on a scale of 1-5, where 1 is not at all and 5 is a lot, how useful visitors found the exhibition. The scoring for this is shown in this Table.

Number of individuals	Score
1	1
0	2
1	3
10	4
62	5

Table 2

Visitors were also asked to explain their scoring to question 1 however, most chose not to do so. This table shows the responses to this part of question 1.

Score	Explanation
1	None given
3	Some of the proposed 'aspirational sites' difficult to identify
4	<p>Better to see large scale plans</p> <p>Good to see plans and aerial views</p> <p>Very useful to have plans explained</p> <p>Shows smaller infill sites in more detail</p>
5	<p>Helpful to see the proposed land highlighted and hear the thinking behind it</p> <p>Very well set out – easy to understand</p> <p>Useful to see all the proposals</p> <p>Very good, clear explanations from Adrian Dale who has extensive knowledge of the village</p> <p>Very useful to see how decisions made over the years have impacted village. Makes us very aware of the importance to have our say now for our children</p> <p>Very clear – easy to understand proposals</p> <p>Very useful maps and application documents supplemented by informative discussions</p> <p>More clear about certain areas now as relatively new to area</p> <p>Very useful now understand whats going on re Chelston Rise thank you</p> <p>Well laid out and explained</p> <p>Very informative</p> <p>Very informative as did not know the extent of the development plans</p> <p>Duchy Field</p> <p>Interested in Duchy Field</p> <p>All plans in one place, where the public can see</p> <p>Extremely useful in the fact that it shows visually and with being spoken through it gives it more meaning and clearly you are able to identify the future impact</p> <p>Useful to be able to see on maps of the village all potential development sites</p> <p>Very clear/concise explanation of the NDP at this stage of development</p> <p>Good to see where all the sites are</p> <p>Very well presented – and clearly</p> <p>Diagrams and maps extremely useful and explanatory</p> <p>I learnt where all the proposed sites are located and the scale at which they would be developed</p> <p>Very clearly laid out and all aspects covered in detail so residents can make informed decisions</p>

List 1

Question 2 asked visitors if they understood what an 'aspirational site' was. Thirty (30) individuals who answered yes to this question added information on their understanding of an aspiration site as shown in this table.

1. What someone would like to develop
2. Where someone wants to develop
3. Hopes for development – development not guaranteed but considered on balance of other requests
4. Somewhere landowners have put forward as a potential site for future development
5. Area of possible but no prescribed development
6. A site someone has proposed
7. Would like – but will not necessarily get!
8. What people would aspire to, does not mean it will actually happen
9. A site that someone has put forward to potentially develop in the future
10. We are one!
11. The desire/opportunity to put forward land for housing development over the next 20 years, to be considered by the village/committee/planners etc
12. A site which a landowner may like to build on in the future but for which no planning permission has been granted
13. What people would like to future develop
14. Aspiration by a landowner
15. Re-production of peoples land
16. Re-development of peoples land
17. Proposed garden developments
18. A site for future needs
19. Outline of plans, not detailed
20. Explained clearly by reps in exhibition
21. Sites put forward for future building
22. A site put forward by a landowner for future development
23. Site proposed for inclusion in the NDP
24. A wish list – may not be granted
25. Potential development site
26. A site that a local landowner wishes to consider for development in next 20 years
27. Projected developments e.g. next 20 years
28. What landowners would like to do with their land
29. A site where someone has suggested some kind of development in the next 20 years – no planning permission/grantee is given
30. Expected future planning applications over the next 20 years

List 2 & 3

Question 5 asked visitors if the exhibition had encouraged them to attend future NDP meetings. Out of the eleven (11) individuals who had replied **maybe** four (4) added information on their response as shown in **list 2** and out of the sixty-two (62) who replied **yes** seventeen (17) added information on their response as shown in **list 3**.

List 2

- Time constraints
- They are doing an excellent job in balancing wishes of landowners, need for housing and the desires of existing residents
- If there is a major development then I'll probably come along
- Would be interested in attending meetings when discussing aspirational sites near my home

List 3

- Its interesting to see in this visual way whats set to change in our village
- Will definitely get involved in all future meetings
- I feel it would be extra important to attend meetings and [ut your opinion across if you want the plan in place
- Interested in development and voicing our views
- Helped to see the development wanted
- Realising how it affects us as there are many more proposals than I would have thought
- Duchy Field
- Furthering information
- To have a say on what happens to our village
- Community views needed
- Especially in relation directly to the Water Lane area
- Be able to pass my views on developing the two villages
- Having a personal interest makes this a worthwhile experience
- Will continue to attend
- Heighten interest
- When other commitments allow!
- To oppose too much development

List 4, 5 & 6

Question 7 asked individuals if they answered yes to question 6 'had the exhibition influenced their views in any way'. Individuals were asked to explain the reason for their answers and the following three lists show the answers to this question.

List 4

These individuals answered **no** to question 7

- No supports my thoughts on development
- No reason still want sympathetic infills
- No as fully understand that standing still is not an option

List 5

These individuals answered **yes** to question 7

- Yes it has. A few affordable houses for young people would be nice but only a few
- Yes it made it easier to identify sites
- Yes it has changed I view the proposed developments which could take place
- Yes it has strengthened my view against the developments
- Yes it has, it makes you realise that the village needs to expand, but not too quickly. Also a good percentage of the new houses need to be affordable for young families
- Yes, I would oppose some but balance views
- Yes – I now feel too much development is planned

List 6

These individuals answered did not answer **yes or no** to question 7

- Numbers/proposals now visible as locations
- Some development maybe necessary but the character of the village needs to be considered carefully
- I have the same opinions. We do not 'need' more development. If we have to 'have it' I would prefer to have a say and this forms the best way
- Detailed info has been beneficial
- My views have not changed but I did not realise there was so much potential for development within the existing village
- A need to speak up. Not complain after the event!
- Were unaware of back garden developments and relocating garages on present dwellings
- Made us appreciate the village must work together to define the future
- To be more involved
- Enhanced my views for small infill development
- Helpful background
- Too many proposed building works encroaching out into the countryside and not infill sites. Also too many people want to build in back gardens
- Easier to understand what the proposals are
- Same view as before – nice to see visualisation though
- There's more to see now
- I have always thought that J.S.T. was the prime site for building on and still think that now
- More explanation, but just encouraged my current views of village development. No large development, infill sites of 2-3 houses ok
- Village needs to be looked at as a whole. Over development will change village 'community'
- Solidified our ideas about what future development may look like
- Has given me a better view of explanation plans

- I still have my first choice, but other sites are worthy of consideration, not, previously known
- Not really – I do not think large scale development is appropriate
- Some of the proposals could change my view on the percentage of development in the village. Although I would still like to see small scale development
- I now realise that there are a list of greedy people in the village who are only out for what they can get without considering the overall impact on the village!
- It has clearly showed how the village could expand and how residents can influence sensible development

List 7

Question 8 asked individuals if there was anything else they would like to tell The NDP Working Party. List 7 shows the twenty-two responses to this question.

- The J.S.T. site would be acceptable
- Careful planning of roads, footpaths and crossings so as to not further divide Chelveston from Caldecott
- Public transport? (re-route occasional Stainwick buses). Drop off/pick up for parcels? Pub?
- Updates
- Concern re: Allan, WPG and CRE developments. Detail aspirations and plans may alter or change during 20 years for any proposed developer
- Thank you for all your hard work in providing this very professional exhibition. Your work is well appreciated
- More at consultation stage
- We would be deeply un-happy if Ray Knight's field on Raunds Road was to be developed in its entirety. We understand that the view from your window doesn't come into it but we paid a lot of money for a house we believed would remain surrounded by open countryside
- No thanks except good and informative exhibition. Thank you
- We are particularly interested in the development behind Water Lane (S. Craythorn's) - the ownership of the access lane has been on going. We would be concerned about the access route to this development
- The plan final stages will be difficult, but the process seems robust enough to cope with the objections that will arise
- I would not like to see 'housing estates' – ribbon developments would be more appropriate. Proper use of Section 106 agreements to achieve betterment within the village
- Some of the proposals detract from the fact that this is a village and have the potential to change the face of the village in a negative way. I would like to see Section 106 agreements to benefit the village if developments are approved

- I would prefer infill and ribbon developments with no additional housing estates. I would support the small development at Chelston Rise, though additional traffic may be a problem
- Excellent exhibition. Thank you for taking the time and effort in ensuring all residents have access to all aspects of aspirational sites
- Not to expand too much!
- Would prefer to keep village small
- We were unaware of the NDP – and as the house we rent could be demolished - will be opposed to any changes at Chelston Rise
- A lot of people really appreciate everything your doing with this exhibition as well
- I would like cycle paths to Higham and Raunds to be provided in the future. Connecting to Stainwick Lakes via Stainwick with safe access across A45 would also be very useful
- In our opinion it makes sense to develop infill areas plus the J.S.T. site as this would improve the appearance of the village
- Interested in high speed Broadband

List 8

Question 9 asked individuals if there was any additional information they needed about the Neighbourhood Development Planning process. List 8 shows the two responses to this question.

- Information on future events and meetings would be gratefully welcome
- An excellent informative exhibition

Comments from Post-it-notes

Visitors to the exhibition were asked to consider 'What is your vision for the village in 2033?

Out of the 122 visitors to the exhibition 34 individual posted comments on a flipchart. Some of these individuals supported comments already made by others and some posted their own comments. All are listed below in table one.

Table 1

	Comments	
1	Please infill only. No development over 1-2 per plot. All to be sympathetic to existing adjacent houses.	
2	Limited infill only. NO LARGE DEVELOPMENT! Which would alter the character of a small, ancient village	3 other individuals supported this comment Total 4 individuals
3	Infill only. No large development of the village, too much traffic already	2 other individuals supported this comment Total 3 individuals
4	Infill only to keep as a village Maintain existing village perimeter and not making bigger	3 other individuals supported this comment Total 4 individuals
5	INFILL ONLY – NO LARGE DEVELOPMENT I can see Raunds Road becoming more and more busy. We have no infrastructure at present – will this improve!	1 other individual supported this comment Total 2 individuals
6	'Recognisable' from the villages of today but with sympathetic infills	
7	Keep the nature and character of the village so <u>no</u> over development, infill only!	
8	Make Chelveston Prettier! A good start would be to build houses on J.S.T. We do not want to lose our village though.	2 other individuals supported this comment Total 3 individuals
9	Keep approaches to village unchanged so character is the same	
10	No development on Raunds Road – too much traffic	
11	I like the idea of a Village Green! No Development of Raunds Road, Too much Traffic	
12	Would not want development S009 – busy road/ houses already existing on Kimbolton Road.	
13	A few more affordable houses	2 other individuals supported this comment Total 3 individuals
14	No mass development at Duchy Close	1 other individuals supported this comment Total 2 individuals
15	Duchy Close plan creates a nice new village green for the new	

	residents! We aren't opposed to plans but it needs better thought to current residents. Building houses against current houses is not what we would welcome.	
16	If houses are to be built at Chelston Rise - the bare minimum please i.e. 20	1 other individuals supported this comment Total 2 individuals
17	No more houses at Chelston Rise	2 other individuals supported this comment Total 3 individuals