



Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Parish Council

July 2004

Dear Resident

At the Annual Parish Assembly in April 2004, the Parish Council was asked to conduct an interim village appraisal to update the key findings of the 2002 full appraisal. The results will now form our response East Northamptonshire Council's request for feedback on its development plans for Higham Ferrers and the surrounding villages.

We had an excellent response 250 electors returned a questionnaire (80% of the electorate). Missing responses have been considered as "no opinions" in the results below to ensure that all of our figures are considered as a percentage of the village as a whole.

1. The following priorities have been proposed by the District Council for Higham Ferrers and the surrounding areas? What do you think is important?

Priority	Very Important	Important	No Opinion	Not Important	Waste of Effort
a) Improving town centres and promoting town living.	18%	43%	36%	2%	2%
b) Stimulating employment opportunities	30%	36%	30%	3%	1%
c) Improving the environmental and visual quality of the area	38%	34%	26%	1%	0%
d) Promoting affordable housing in all communities	26%	28%	37%	8%	2%
e) Avoiding town cramming	21%	27%	42%	10%	0%
f) Maintaining and enhancing services and facilities	36%	38%	25%	0%	0%
g) Increasing community involvement in local events	17%	36%	37%	7%	3%

Other priorities (please list)

Building/Planning

Strive to use brown field land wherever possible, preserving rural villages and avoiding annexation

Avoid using green and recreational areas for housing

Traffic Management

Focus on traffic calming especially on the B645

Focus on getting boy racers off the streets and controlling the rogue motorbikers

Enforce 30mph and 7.5 tonne limits in villages

Safer roads for cyclists with cycle paths & bridle ways

Amenities/Services

More buses from villages to towns

Keep vandalism under control and repair quickly to maintain quality of the environment

Provision of allotments

Keeping village clean

Removal of overhead power lines in the village

Recreational area at the top of Duchy Close or play area in the village to encourage exercise

Employment must be relevant to rural community ie not industrial or storage units

The message for the District Council is that there should be a focus on preserving or improving services and on maintaining the environment conditions and visual appearance of the area. For the Parish Council, the current emphasis on traffic calming received much support in the written commentary.

2. What additional resources or facilities would you support and use if appropriate?

Facility or Resource	Very Important	Important	No Opinion	Not Important	Completely Opposed to it
a) Affordable Housing	17%	23%	43%	8%	9%
b) Community shop	29%	22%	37%	10%	1%
c) Refurbished Village Hall	18%	27%	43%	10%	2%
d) Circular path around village	23%	27%	38%	12%	1%
e) Footpath to Higham Ferrers	24%	20%	37%	17%	2%
f) Footpath to Raunds	23%	21%	37%	18%	2%

Support for a community shop is considerably lower than in the 2002 and 1995 appraisals probably reflecting that even more people in the Village now have transport. Support for the refurbishment of the Village Hall appears to have increased significantly since 2002 with 45% of the electorate feeling that it is important, balancing the 43% with no opinion. There continues to be strong support for improvements to footpath arrangements but by no means a majority.

3. The A6 by-pass has potentially opened up parts of Rushden, Higham Ferrers and Stanwick to new developments along its route. Which of these development options would you be in favour of?

Town or Village Location	Type of Development					No Opinion
	Major green field Developments (>10 houses)	Small green field developments (5-10 houses)	Industrial or farm site Conversion (5-10 houses)	Restricted in-fill within existing housing (1-4 houses)	No developments should be allowed	
a) Rushden	25%	16%	9%	15%	7%	28%
b) Higham Ferrers	10%	20%	13%	19%	10%	29%
c) Stanwick	3%	11%	13%	28%	16%	29%
d) Between Rushden & Higham	13%	15%	9%	16%	17%	29%
e) Between Stanwick & Higham	6%	14%	5%	15%	33%	27%

The responses to this question indicate that villagers are broadly in favour of significant development in Rushden and to a lesser extent in Higham Ferrers. However, in Stanwick the view is that development should be largely restricted to “in fill” developments and there is clearly a strong view that development along the A6 Higham/Stanwick corridor should be discouraged or restricted to avoid Stanwick and Higham becoming joined into a single conurbation. The Parish Council will ensure that these views are represented to the District Council.

4. Within Chelveston and Caldecott there are many possible locations that could be used for housing development over the next 15-20 years. Where would you want the Parish Council to *encourage* development proposals?

Village Location	Type of Development					
	Major green field Developments (>10 houses)	Small green field developments (5-10 houses)	Industrial or farm site Conversion (5-10 houses)	Restricted in-fill within existing housing (1-4 houses)	No developments should be allowed	No Opinion
a) Fields to the north of Sawyers Crescent	4%	14%	3%	10%	39%	29%
b) Fields along the undeveloped side of Raunds Road	5%	12%	1%	9%	45%	29%
c) Fields along Water Lane	1%	6%	2%	9%	55%	29%
d) Field at the top of Duchy Close	14%	10%	1%	6%	40%	29%
e) JST Industrial Unit Site	1%	8%	20%	25%	17%	29%
f) Fields to the east of Kimbolton Road	7%	6%	0%	6%	49%	31%
g) Field opposite Village Hall & through to Caldecott	6%	8%	2%	5%	50%	29%
h) Sites on same side as the Village Hall	4%	3%	1%	22%	43%	27%
i) Caldecott Farm Buildings	5%	2%	26%	14%	23%	30%
j) Caldecott Transport Depot	5%	4%	25%	14%	23%	29%

The results of the development question show some significant differences from the 2002 result. In 2002 we asked whether residents were in favour of development generally across the Village but without allowing comments or choices on specific locations. In 2002, 23% of the electorate were opposed to any development at all. In 2004, only 29 respondents (9%) were opposed to all development. A further 31 respondents (10%) were opposed to all developments except for on the site JST and Caldecott Transport depot.

Whilst 60% of the Village were in favour of *encouraging* some developments, the responses analysed by post code showed a very clear message - NOT IN MY BACK YARD. Across the Village almost no-one was in favour of major development near their own house. Overall, there was strongest support for major development in the field at the top of Duchy Close but even here only 14% of the Village were in favour – and only one of these was actually a Duchy Close resident!

Conversion of the JST site received strong support with 54% of residents in favour of some development and only 17% against. Even in Duchy Close, Foot Lane and Higham Road – those most affected, there was support for some development from over 50% of residents. The Parish Council has learned from JST that they are interested in moving to Higham Ferrers and a conversion of the Chelveston site is certainly a possibility. With the mandate provided by this survey, the Parish Council will support local residents getting involved in the detailed re-design of this site in conjunction with JST management. This should ensure the best possible outcome for the village.

There is a similar picture with the Caldecott farm buildings and transport depot – broad support for some development work with only 23% of the whole Village completely opposed. Opposition was slightly higher from Caldecott residents with 37% being opposed to any re-development work on these sites. However, here again, there is a mandate for some collaborative design work between residents, the Parish Council and the land owners.

5. Turnout was noticeably higher in areas of the Village with obvious development potential, particularly those areas mentioned in the District plans.

Road	Post Code	Properties	Electors	Responses	%
Britten Close	AY	7	19	16	84%
Caldecott & Caldecott Road	AR, AT	20	40	39	98%
Duchy Close	AW	26	48	44	92%
The Green, Foot Lane, Higham Road	AH, AJ, AX	20	37	21	57%
High Street, Pokas Cottages	AL, AS	11	16	12	75%
Hillside	AQ	16	28	22	79%
Kimbolton Road, Disbrowe Court	AN, RA	10	21	11	52%
Raunds Road	AA, AB	17	37	29	78%
Sawyers Crescent, St Georges Row	AD, AE	15	28	26	93%
Water Lane	AF, AG, AP	21	38	29	76%
			312	249	80%

The Parish Council will therefore be in a strong position to represent those views to the District in its response to the proposals. However, it is still important that individual residents make their own representations to the District. Links to the proposals from the District can be found on the District Council web site –

<http://www.east-northamptonshire.gov.uk/ppimageupload/Image7771.PDF>

The specific questions related to the Village are:

If you live in Chelveston-cum-Caldecott or Newton Bromswold, please tell us what you consider are the needs and aspirations of your village and how this should be reflected in the definition of village boundaries over the next twenty years?

What are your views on developing the fields to the North of Sawyers Crescent and those at the top of Duchy Close?

Should the new Local Development Framework seek to prohibit or limit infill development in villages?

Responses are required by the end of July and can be sent to:

Strategy and Policy Directorate
 Planning Policy
 FREEPOST NH2352
 East Northamptonshire Council
 East Northamptonshire House
 Cedar Drive
 Thrapston
 Northamptonshire NN14 4LZ

Alternatively you can e-mail to
localplan@east-northamptonshire.gov.uk