



Mr Adrian Dale  
Water Lane  
Chelveston

February 9<sup>th</sup> 2014

Dear Adrian,

Having sat through the six meetings and listened to the proposals we would like to share with you some of our initial thoughts.

The Neighbourhood Development Plan affords a unique opportunity to influence the future of our village community and the efforts of you and the NDP working group are to be applauded. However it is apparent from the village attendance at the meetings that outside the areas of immediate interest and impact there seems to be apathy about the future development of Chelveston/Caldecott/ Chelston Rise as a whole.

At the time of the 2012 survey, we were of the opinion that if development is inevitable then it should be focussed on linking the three communities together with controlled development. Our views have, as a result of the six meetings on aspirational sites changed and we now feel that the three locations should retain their relative independent character and the links should be social with physical links via footpaths and cycle ways. Future housing plans should therefore be largely independent.

We don't wish to comment on every proposal but here are our views on some of the them.

Of all the proposals the only one that received almost universal support was for houses on the JST site (NDP-S013) and indeed if adopted would meet a large percentage of the desired increase in houses proposed from the village survey. The issue here is the assumption that JST will leave in the next five years. From the comment's of Jason Kew (JST) at the meeting, this would seem highly unlikely, because of the current state of land prices and the current site is potentially very expensive to develop. As a result we do not feel that as a village community we should rely on the development of the JST site to meet our development wishes. However, if it did happen, it would certainly be an improvement over the current use of the land. and would provide a unique opportunity to define the character of the centre of Chelveston one aspect of which is to insist upon stone facing at least to the roadside house in the proposed development.

As far as the proposal for the development of Duchy field (NDP-S021) is concerned. We feel strongly that this should NOT go ahead. It removes a significant part of a field that contributes to the rural aspect of the approach to Chelveston and opens the door to future development of the remaining part of the field. Also while the access and egress from the proposed site via four access points with the B645 is a planning issue, it must be considered as a requirement for the site. In our view, in spite of the opinion of the highways inspector, we are very concerned about the increased risk of accidents on a road already noted for the volume of high speed traffic. There are also a number of other issues relating to duplication of facilities and the impact of increasing Chelveston by 30% with all its associated demands that argue against this site

The residents of Caldecott showed a good deal of passion for retaining the rural nature of their village – one aspect of this was to maintain the rural nature of Bidwell Lane and not to open the door for it to become Bidwell Road as a result of the collective development resulting from a number of individual proposals. We would agree with this and believe it also applies to Water Lane, in Chelveston with its stream, footbridges, pathways and open field aspects. In this context we would not object to Phase 1 (NDP- S018) but would have concerns about Phase 2 (NDP-S018) and the collective impact with NDP-S011 and NDP-S001 on Bidwell Lane.

On a positive note, the Britten Close proposals have some merit. We are supportive of the amendment proposed by you i.e. access to the proposed bungalows via the Kimbolton Road rather than via Britten Close so as not to set a precedent for building behind buildings. We also believe there is merit in the proposed development of St. George's Row (NDP-S005) and Sawyers Crescent (NDP-S006) but not the proposal for the development of Kimbolton Road (NDP-S009).

In conclusion whatever the agreed upon plan, it should move us towards what the residents feel would contribute to the rural community that the majority sought when moving into the area. In this context when deciding upon the merits of the proposals residents should consider whether the impact of the proposals on the rural community either individually or collectively is positive, negative or neutral. We personally would prefer to see smaller 1-5 house developments (e.g. **Britten Close**) rather than large ones such as the 50 proposed for **Duchy Field**.

As always we will be pleased to discuss any aspects of the above with you.

Kind regards

