



From: [Adrian Dale](mailto:Adrian.Dale@ndp.chelveston.org.uk)  
 To: Sue  
 Cc: [chair@ndp.chelveston.org.uk](mailto:chair@ndp.chelveston.org.uk); [Clerk@chelveston.org.uk](mailto:Clerk@chelveston.org.uk)  
 Subject: NDP-0176 - Response to resident's question on the outcome of poll on NDP-S019a  
 Date: 24 March 2014 13:05:13

Sue,

Thanks for your compliments – it was hard work, but I hope worth it.

We need to now go through formal analysis and interpretation of the results in the Working Party to determine which are the preferred options to go forward. This will require a full analysis of the comments made (there were 2365 comments made on the various proposals).

With regard to NDP-S019a, I can say nothing other than the fact that 51% of people rejected it in the whole village. This breaks down as follows:

23% of Chelston Rise residents gave it full support and 18% conditional support, 58% of Chelston Rise residents rejected it which taking into account the turnout there (high) means that 55 of 95 electors at Chelston Rise rejected the proposal (a majority of all residents not just the 77% of residents who voted).

Turning to Caldecott: Just 18% of Caldecott residents supported NDP-S019a with another 13% conditional support. 66% of Caldecott residents rejected it outright.

These are the people who would be strongly affected and you can see what message they have sent from the results above.

There is some suggestion of tactical voting from the centre of Chelveston – voting for development which would have a minimal impact on them. However, it was still not a majority vote in favour. Here are the comments (I have not had chance to build the system to display them all yet) from people who gave conditional support for 35 houses (NDP-S019a). You will see that many of the conditional support comments only offer support if the numbers are significantly reduced.

if it was cut down to 20 other wise too many
Facilities needed first - pathway to village - doctors etc
If the number of houses were reduced to around 20, then perhaps it could be considered
No more than 30 houses. Also traffic calming measures to be implemented. Since Chelston Rise became occupied the volume of traffic and speeding traffic has undoubtedly increased It would again with more dwellings being occupied.
Fewer dwellings taking into account local need for affordable housing
Affordable housing is a necessity in this area
If limited to 20 & over 10 years
do not need 35, dwellings,15-20 would be better
Would support but not with the added footpath into Caldecott on into Chelveston. There are no facilities in either of the villages to need a footpath.
The construction needs to be different from the existing as the &quot;RAF style&quot; houses are old fashioned - use of stone style brick would make it more attractive
I do not object to this development but I do not feel there is a need for a footpath along the roadside through Caldecott onto Chelveston. There are no local facilities in either village that would benefit this development so what is the point of a footpath?
housing materials need to be considered as I feel the brickwork in Chelston Rise is rather unattractive.
Fewer houses
Number of dwellings reduced by at least half
I would support 35 as long as the additional 70 below are not allowed.
Number reduced and traffic calming through Caldecott
Prefer 20-25 dwellings to be in keeping with existing density of Chelston - consider small shop in addition
Lesser Density
Feel that current that would mean smaller plot sizes and house squeezed together. If house had same/similar plot sizes to rest of Chelston Rise then a possibility of supporting 20 homes.
The roads and access seem unsuitable for so many users.
Smaller development 5 - 10 homes in the same style as are currently there
Less density
Reduce number of dwellings to about 15, otherwise a rapid influx of residence into the village will occur and the pub would be too crowded, don't go thinking you can build another pub because that's just not what this village is about. However a BIGGER pub, well now your convincing me...but in all seriousness if this were to happen I would like to see a smaller expansion first, then observe the effect on the village and allow this to determine future expansion.
The size of the application is too big, a smaller plot with 10 dwellings would be more in line with the preferred growth of the village.
I would support a <u>maximum</u> of TEN houses to continue the &#39;horseshoe&#39; shape of the crescent, but leave the field as it is so build on old school foundations but leave the field as many of us walk dogs etc
speed reduction methods on all roads in chelveston needed
too many houses! it will take away the open feel. i would agree if there weren't as many houses. i would consider moving if they got the go ahead on the above proposal
Only 20 houses
Facilities ie a pub, shop would probably have to be considered at Chelston Rise, there would be a significant increase in people using the pub and due to its distance and remoteness from Chelston rise it is inevitable that residents would drink and drive. 
over development of site. More low cost homes
I don't see this as excessive provided the contractor implements highways improvements and awards the parish benefits
This did not involve knocking down any existing homes on the site. A small number of 5 bed units were included, say 2 or 3 - mainly because I would like to buy one.
35 houses is an over development of Chelston Rise. I would support 10-15 houses on the old school site continued as a Crescent in the same style
they reduce the number of houses. 35 houses will take away the whole feel of the estate. the kids play on the fields and the playground already in situ. would you be prepared to put in another tarmac playground??? it is ideal for the kids for skating/skateboarding and learning to ride bikes etc
Support some development but not on the scale proposed should complement exist not almost double the size.
Only 20 houses to be built
Facilities ie a pub, shop would probably have to be considered at Chelston Rise, there would be a significant increase in people using the pub and due to its distance and remoteness from Chelston rise it is inevitable that residents would drink and drive.
Improvement in the road, this development could generate approximately 50 additional vehicles which the current road would struggle to accommodate.
Buildings must be in keeping with the current properties retianing nos 43, 45 & 47 & optimise upstairs better in the end terraced
There are a number of proposals for this area and 35 houses seems to be too great a number
Far too many houses for the area and they need to be of a similar build and design as existing housing so it doesn't make the estate look over developed and crowded. Careful consideration needs to be given to visitors parking to the houses
IF LESS
No objections to housing development on this site but feel that 20-25 houses would be more appropriate.
As shown this is overdevelopment. I would support maximum of 22 properties with individual parking and garaging facilities. See notes to plab B below.
Far too many houses for the site and needs to be scaled down and made similar to the houses already present at chelston rise
IF NO MORE THAN 30
I would find a much smaller development of a few houses acceptable, but this is far too many as it would increase the housing by more than 50%. This land is previously undeveloped & should largely remain so.

if 18 properties 2015-2020 and 17 2020 to 2035
It will all depend on the final design.
maximum 15 houses built in the same style as houses already there and a grass area kept for exercising the dogs on the estate (large area)
Fewer houses, improved playing area, protection of more green space for dog exercise, and introductions of footpaths between the site and caldecott/old airfield site.

In summary, at this stage I can only provide you with the raw data without interpretation. The Working Party will be meeting both in Private Session and the in Public Meetings on dates to be announced. I would strongly encourage you to come to the public meeting to make your case for what interpretation you would like to see on the data in the public speaking section at the start. It would be helpful to have your views in writing beforehand so they can then be taken properly into consideration. I am sure that WPG will be making a response, so it is only reasonable that residents can too!

Regards

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

EEmail: [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

**From:** Sue

**Sent:** 24 March 2014 09:25

**To:** Adrian Dale

**Subject:** FW: NDP Updates: 2014-03-23 (23rd March 2014) - RESULTS OF THE Neighbourhood Poll

Hi Adrian

Thanks for the email below, and thanks to you and all of the NDP working party for all of their hard work around this whole piece.

I'm really pleased with the result of the 70 house plan as this has been thoroughly rejected, but wondered about the 35 house plan, this was slimly rejected outright by the majority, so does this mean the end of the WPG applications for these 2 aspirational sites?

I know they can come back to develop the brown field school site, but just wanted clarification about the process given the results for the 35 house plan?

Sue