



WARNING: This is a 211 page document – Please do not print



Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Parish Council Northamptonshire Neighbourhood Development Plan

Your Plan, Your Village, Your Future
Residents have made their views very clear!

Raw Results of the Neighbourhood Plan Poll

Attached are the raw results of the Neighbourhood Plan poll. They can be found online at <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-RESULTS>. So far only the raw statistical data relating to the vote has been analysed. We still need to analyse and categorise comments and look at the answers to the questions on how people want the Village to develop.

Voter and Household Turnout

The turnout was excellent – 80% of registered voters and 82% of households returned a vote. There were no spoiled papers – everyone's views will count.

Interpreting the Results

The results need further analysis before conclusions can be drawn. However, there are some very clear collective opinions on which propositions have been overwhelmingly supported and which have clearly been rejected. In the middle are some propositions for which the comments need to be analysed to help understand the diverse opinions. We then need to formulate policies against which all the sites can be objectively assessed. Only then will we draw up the final list of preferred sites.

Next steps

The Working Party will be holding a series of meetings to discuss the results. Some will be private meetings where detailed discussions of the data will occur. These will be followed by public meetings where the Working Party will present their interpretation for consideration by residents and land owners. The Working Party will report where it has reached to the Annual Parish Assembly on Tuesday 22nd April 2014. Residents will then be able to give a steer on which direction the Neighbourhood Plan should take.

Residents can continue to submit comments to the working party by email, on paper or via the website:

Email: survey@ndp.chelveston.org.uk

Web: <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/comment>

Paper: 21 Water Lane, NN9 6AP

Phone: 01933 622624, 07850 570007

NDP Voting Returns Analysis

27th March 2014

Table 1

Post Code	House Baseline	Voter Baseline	Postal Return	Web Return	Voter Return	Household Return	Voter Turnout	Household Turnout	Settlement
NN9 6AR - Caldecott/Bidwell	13	33	23	10	33	13	100%	100%	Caldecott
NN9 6AL - Pokas Cottages	5	10	10	-	10	5	100%	100%	Chelveston
NN9 6AE - St Georges Row	4	8	6	2	8	4	100%	100%	Chelveston
NN9 6AS - High Street	4	7	7	-	7	4	100%	100%	Chelveston
NN9 6AH - Higham Road	2	4	4	-	4	2	100%	100%	Chelveston
NN9 6RA - Disbrowe Court	6	16	13	2	15	6	94%	100%	Chelveston
NN9 6AX - Foot Lane	5	11	9	1	10	5	91%	100%	Chelveston
NN9 6AF - Wateryard - Water Lane	7	16	11	3	14	7	88%	100%	Chelveston
NN9 6AJ - The Green	14	25	16	6	22	13	88%	93%	Chelveston
NN9 6AP Water Lane Nos 1 to Hill House	10	22	17	4	21	9	95%	90%	Chelveston
NN9 6AW - Duchy Close	26	53	35	12	47	23	89%	88%	Chelveston
NN9 6AY - Britten Close	8	16	13	2	15	7	94%	88%	Chelveston
NN9 6AG - Water Lane - Scaraben to Hall Farm House	5	13	11	-	11	4	85%	80%	Chelveston
NN9 6AD - Sawyers Crescent	10	22	13	1	14	8	64%	80%	Chelveston
NN9 6AU - The Crescent	47	95	54	19	73	37	77%	79%	Chelston Rise
NN9 6AB - Raunds Road	18	45	21	9	30	14	67%	78%	Chelveston
NN9 6AT - Caldecott Road	4	6	5	-	5	3	83%	75%	Caldecott
NN9 6AN - Kimbolton Road	5	10	1	2	3	2	30%	40%	Chelveston
NN9 6AQ - Hillside	14	26	8	-	8	4	31%	29%	Chelveston
Totals	207	438	277	73	350	170	80%	82%	

Table 2

Settlement	House Baseline	Voter Baseline	Settlement	Voter Return	Household Return	Voter Turnout	Household Turnout
Caldecott	17	39	Caldecott	38	16	97%	94%
Chelveston	143	304	Chelveston	239	117	79%	82%
Chelston Rise	47	95	Chelston Rise	73	37	77%	79%
Totals	207	438	Totals	350	170	80%	82%

Summary of voting on each proposition

Table 3

Voting for Proposition	Full support	% full support	Would Support	% cond. support	Full Rejection	% full rejection	No Opinion	% no opinion	Check Total
NDP-S004a - Chapman - Barn	293	84%	8	2%	40	11%	9	3%	350
NDP-S013 - JST	251	72%	40	11%	47	13%	12	3%	350
NDP-S004b - Chapman - Cottage	230	66%	10	3%	95	27%	15	4%	350
NDP-S007 - Knight - Water Lane	217	62%	12	3%	105	30%	16	5%	350
NDP-S001 - Duchy - Bidwell	211	60%	40	11%	89	25%	10	3%	350
NDP-S002 - Oliver - Kimbolton Rd	170	49%	17	5%	145	41%	18	5%	350
NDP-S015 - Craythorn	155	44%	15	4%	163	47%	17	5%	350
NDP-S018b - Mommersteeg - Bidwell	145	41%	28	8%	162	46%	15	4%	350
NDP-S018a - Mommersteeg - Caldecott Rd	144	41%	20	6%	171	49%	15	4%	350
NDP-S005 - Elldred	131	37%	42	12%	159	45%	18	5%	350
NDP-S006 - Knight - Raunds & Sawyers	126	36%	59	17%	152	43%	13	4%	350
NDP-S017 - Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - Britten Close	119	34%	36	10%	180	51%	15	4%	350
NDP-S019a - WPG - Chelston Rise 35 houses	106	30%	52	15%	180	51%	12	3%	350
NDP-S014 - Allen - Chelston Rise 6-8 houses	104	30%	18	5%	217	62%	11	3%	350
NDP-S008 - Keith Carr - Raunds Road	74	21%	29	8%	232	66%	15	4%	350
NDP-S020a - CRE - Renewables	44	13%	22	6%	272	78%	12	3%	350
NDP-S021 - Stuart Carr - Duchy Field	41	12%	46	13%	251	72%	12	3%	350
NDP-S020b - CRE - New housing/employment	28	8%	20	6%	290	83%	12	3%	350
NDP-S019b - WPG - Chelston Rise 70 houses	13	4%	12	3%	317	91%	8	2%	350

Sorted on the % full support column - highest support to lowest not taking into account any "would support" (conditional support) votes

This order does not imply any preference or decision by the working party on which are to be recommended as preferred sites

Further analysis of comments and the distribution of votes by post code will be necessary to come to a conclusion

Full support from which post codes

Table 4

Proposition	NN9 6AR NN9 6AT	NN9 6AB NN9 6AS NN9 6AY	NN9 6AD NN9 6AE	NN9 6AF NN9 6AG NN9 6AP	NN9 6AH NN9 6AJ NN9 6AL NN9 6AN NN9 6AX NN9 6RA	NN9 6AQ NN9 6AW	NN9 6AU	Total Votes in Support	% Total Support
NDP-S004a - Chapman - Barn	87%	77%	77%	78%	91%	87%	84%	293	84%
NDP-S013 - JST	68%	81%	59%	85%	78%	76%	53%	251	72%
NDP-S004b - Chapman - Cottage	45%	65%	59%	72%	77%	62%	68%	230	66%
NDP-S007 - Knight - Water Lane	50%	73%	68%	61%	58%	65%	60%	217	62%
NDP-S001 - Duchy - Bidwell	32%	56%	64%	54%	73%	64%	67%	211	60%
NDP-S002 - Oliver - Kimbolton Rd	37%	40%	36%	43%	63%	49%	55%	170	49%
NDP-S015 - Craythorn	21%	46%	45%	20%	61%	29%	67%	155	44%
NDP-S018b - Mommersteeg - Bidwell	18%	50%	27%	39%	47%	33%	55%	145	41%
NDP-S018a - Mommersteeg - Caldecott Rd	21%	44%	41%	39%	63%	31%	40%	144	41%
NDP-S005 - Elldred	21%	31%	9%	28%	53%	27%	59%	131	37%
NDP-S006 - Knight - Raunds & Sawyers	45%	21%	14%	35%	45%	25%	49%	126	36%
NDP-S017 - Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - Britten Close	24%	33%	23%	30%	42%	25%	45%	119	34%
NDP-S019a - WPG - Chelston Rise 35 houses	18%	29%	36%	24%	44%	36%	23%	106	30%
NDP-S014 - Allen - Chelston Rise 6-8 houses	5%	40%	41%	33%	52%	31%	10%	104	30%
NDP-S008 - Keith Carr - Raunds Road	50%	4%	18%	4%	22%	20%	30%	74	21%
NDP-S020a - CRE - Renewables	13%	10%	9%	11%	17%	5%	18%	44	13%
NDP-S021 - Stuart Carr - Duchy Field	24%	10%	14%	4%	19%	0%	14%	41	12%
NDP-S020b - CRE - New housing/employment	11%	12%	9%	0%	14%	7%	4%	28	8%
NDP-S019b - WPG - Chelston Rise 70 houses	0%	4%	18%	2%	6%	4%	0%	13	4%

Sorted on the % Total Support column - highest support to lowest

This order does not imply any preference or decision by the working party on which are to be recommended as preferred sites

Further analysis of comments and the distribution of votes by post code will be necessary to come to a conclusion

Amendment: (25/03/2014) In NDP-RESULTS/v1.0 - the post code breakdown for NDP-S018b was shown to be the same as NDP-S018a. This has been corrected.

The amendment has no impact on Table 3 (Summary of voting on each proposition) - where the data was shown correctly

Table 4 has been re-sorted to reflect the amended entry for NDP-S018b

Conditional Support from which post codes**Table 5**

Proposition	NN9 6AR NN9 6AT	NN9 6AB NN9 6AS NN9 6AY	NN9 6AD NN9 6AE	NN9 6AF NN9 6AG NN9 6AP	NN9 6AH NN9 6AJ NN9 6AL NN9 6AN NN9 6AX NN9 6RA	NN9 6AQ NN9 6AW	NN9 6AU	Total votes with conditional support	% conditional support
NDP-S006 - Knight - Raunds & Sawyers	13%	23%	14%	24%	17%	27%	3%	59	17%
NDP-S019a - WPG - Chelston Rise 35 houses	13%	12%	18%	17%	11%	16%	18%	52	15%
NDP-S021 - Stuart Carr - Duchy Field	16%	15%	18%	17%	11%	13%	8%	46	13%
NDP-S005 - Elldred	8%	12%	14%	17%	11%	16%	8%	42	12%
NDP-S001 - Duchy - Bidwell	24%	8%	9%	15%	13%	5%	10%	40	11%
NDP-S013 - JST	13%	4%	18%	11%	14%	13%	11%	40	11%
NDP-S017 - Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - Britten Close	11%	12%	9%	9%	16%	9%	7%	36	10%
NDP-S008 - Keith Carr - Raunds Road	8%	8%	0%	17%	6%	13%	4%	29	8%
NDP-S018b - Mommersteeg - Bidwell	13%	2%	18%	17%	3%	7%	5%	28	8%
NDP-S020a - CRE - Renewables	0%	6%	9%	7%	0%	13%	10%	22	6%
NDP-S018a - Mommersteeg - Caldecott Rd	11%	4%	5%	17%	3%	2%	3%	20	6%
NDP-S020b - CRE - New housing/employment	0%	12%	18%	2%	5%	5%	4%	20	6%
NDP-S014 - Allen - Chelston Rise 6-8 houses	11%	10%	0%	7%	5%	2%	3%	18	5%
NDP-S002 - Oliver - Kimbolton Rd	5%	6%	9%	2%	3%	7%	4%	17	5%
NDP-S015 - Craythorn	0%	6%	9%	11%	3%	2%	3%	15	4%
NDP-S007 - Knight - Water Lane	3%	2%	5%	4%	3%	7%	1%	12	3%
NDP-S019b - WPG - Chelston Rise 70 houses	0%	2%	5%	2%	6%	5%	3%	12	3%
NDP-S004b - Chapman - Cottage	3%	0%	14%	4%	2%	0%	4%	10	3%
NDP-S004a - Chapman - Barn	3%	4%	5%	4%	0%	2%	1%	8	2%

Sorted on the %Conditional Support column - highest support to lowest

This order does not imply any preference or decision by the working party on which are to be recommended as preferred sites

Further analysis of comments and the distribution of votes by post code will be necessary to come to a conclusion

Amendment: (25/03/2014) In NDP-RESULTS/v1.0 - the post code breakdown for NDP-S018b was shown to be the same as NDP-S018a. This has been corrected.

The amendment has no impact on Table 3 (Summary of voting on each proposition) - where the data was shown correctly

Table 5 has been re-sorted to reflect the amended entry for NDP-S018b

Rejection from which post codes

Table 6

Proposition	NN9 6AR NN9 6AT	NN9 6AB NN9 6AS NN9 6AY	NN9 6AD NN9 6AE	NN9 6AF NN9 6AG NN9 6AP	NN9 6AH NN9 6AJ NN9 6AL NN9 6AN NN9 6AX NN9 6RA	NN9 6AQ NN9 6AW	NN9 6AU	Total Votes in Rejection	% Total Rejection
NDP-S019b - WPG - Chelston Rise 70 houses	97%	94%	73%	93%	81%	91%	96%	317	91%
NDP-S020b - CRE - New housing/employment	87%	75%	73%	93%	77%	80%	90%	290	83%
NDP-S020a - CRE - Renewables	84%	83%	77%	78%	77%	82%	68%	272	78%
NDP-S021 - Stuart Carr - Duchy Field	61%	75%	64%	76%	66%	87%	68%	251	72%
NDP-S008 - Keith Carr - Raunds Road	42%	87%	77%	72%	67%	67%	56%	232	66%
NDP-S014 - Allen - Chelston Rise 6-8 houses	82%	48%	55%	54%	39%	65%	86%	217	62%
NDP-S017 - Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - Britten Close	61%	56%	64%	57%	38%	65%	38%	180	51%
NDP-S019a - WPG - Chelston Rise 35 houses	66%	58%	41%	54%	39%	44%	58%	180	51%
NDP-S018a - Mommersteeg - Caldecott Rd	63%	52%	41%	37%	33%	64%	52%	171	49%
NDP-S015 - Craythorn	71%	46%	41%	67%	31%	69%	19%	163	47%
NDP-S018b - Mommersteeg - Bidwell	66%	48%	45%	39%	48%	55%	32%	162	46%
NDP-S005 - Elldred	58%	54%	73%	52%	31%	55%	26%	159	45%
NDP-S006 - Knight - Raunds & Sawyers	39%	54%	68%	39%	34%	47%	38%	152	43%
NDP-S002 - Oliver - Kimbolton Rd	53%	52%	50%	50%	31%	42%	29%	145	41%
NDP-S007 - Knight - Water Lane	45%	21%	18%	33%	34%	27%	29%	105	30%
NDP-S004b - Chapman - Cottage	47%	35%	18%	20%	20%	31%	22%	95	27%
NDP-S001 - Duchy - Bidwell	42%	35%	23%	24%	14%	29%	19%	89	25%
NDP-S013 - JST	18%	13%	9%	4%	5%	11%	27%	47	13%
NDP-S004a - Chapman - Barn	8%	19%	14%	13%	9%	7%	11%	40	11%

Sorted on the % Total Rejection column - highest support to lowest

This order does not imply any preference or decision by the working party on which are to be recommended as preferred sites

Further analysis of comments and the distribution of votes by post code will be necessary to come to a conclusion

Amendment: (25/03/2014) In NDP-RESULTS/v1.0 - the post code breakdown for NDP-S018b was shown to be the same as NDP-S018a. This has been corrected.

The amendment has no impact on Table 3 (Summary of voting on each proposition) - where the data was shown correctly

Table 6 has been re-sorted to reflect the amended entry for NDP-S018b

No opinion from which post codes

Table 7

Proposition	NN9 6AR NN9 6AT	NN9 6AB NN9 6AS NN9 6AY	NN9 6AD NN9 6AE	NN9 6AF NN9 6AG NN9 6AP	NN9 6AH NN9 6AJ NN9 6AL NN9 6AN NN9 6AX NN9 6RA	NN9 6AQ NN9 6AW	NN9 6AU	Total No opinion	% No opinion
NDP-S002 - Oliver - Kimbolton Rd	5%	2%	5%	4%	3%	2%	12%	18	5%
NDP-S005 - Ellidred	13%	4%	5%	2%	5%	2%	7%	18	5%
NDP-S015 - Craythorn	8%	2%	5%	2%	5%	0%	11%	17	5%
NDP-S007 - Knight - Water Lane	3%	4%	9%	2%	5%	0%	10%	16	5%
NDP-S004b - Chapman - Cottage	5%	0%	9%	4%	2%	7%	5%	15	4%
NDP-S008 - Keith Carr - Raunds Road	0%	2%	5%	7%	5%	0%	10%	15	4%
NDP-S017 - Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - Britten Close	5%	0%	5%	4%	5%	0%	10%	15	4%
NDP-S018a - Mommersteeg - Caldecott Rd	5%	0%	14%	7%	2%	4%	5%	15	4%
NDP-S018b - Mommersteeg - Bidwell	3%	0%	9%	4%	2%	5%	8%	15	4%
NDP-S006 - Knight - Raunds & Sawyers	3%	2%	5%	2%	3%	0%	10%	13	4%
NDP-S013 - JST	0%	2%	14%	0%	3%	0%	8%	12	3%
NDP-S019a - WPG - Chelston Rise 35 houses	3%	2%	5%	4%	6%	4%	1%	12	3%
NDP-S020a - CRE - Renewables	3%	2%	5%	4%	6%	0%	4%	12	3%
NDP-S020b - CRE - New housing/employment	3%	2%	0%	4%	5%	7%	1%	12	3%
NDP-S021 - Stuart Carr - Duchy Field	0%	0%	5%	2%	5%	0%	10%	12	3%
NDP-S014 - Allen - Chelston Rise 6-8 houses	3%	2%	5%	7%	5%	2%	1%	11	3%
NDP-S001 - Duchy - Bidwell	3%	2%	5%	7%	0%	2%	4%	10	3%
NDP-S004a - Chapman - Barn	3%	0%	5%	4%	0%	4%	4%	9	3%
NDP-S019b - WPG - Chelston Rise 70 houses	3%	0%	5%	2%	6%	0%	1%	8	2%

Sorted on the % No opinion column - highest support to lowest

This order does not imply any preference or decision by the working party on which are to be recommended as preferred sites

Further analysis of comments and the distribution of votes by post code will be necessary to come to a conclusion

Amendment: (25/03/2014) In NDP-RESULTS/v1.0 - the post code breakdown for NDP-S018b was shown to be the same as NDP-S018a. This has been corrected.

The amendment has no impact on Table 3 (Summary of voting on each proposition) - where the data was shown correctly

Table 7 has been re-sorted to reflect the amended entry for NDP-S018b

Check tally of votes received from each post code

Table 8

	NN9 6AR NN9 6AT	NN9 6AB NN9 6AS NN9 6AY	NN9 6AD NN9 6AE	NN9 6AF NN9 6AG NN9 6AP	NN9 6AH NN9 6AJ NN9 6AL NN9 6AN NN9 6AX NN9 6RA	NN9 6AQ NN9 6AW	NN9 6AU	Total votes
Check Total	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350
NDP-S001 - Duchy - Bidwell	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350
NDP-S002 - Oliver - Kimbolton Rd	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350
NDP-S004a - Chapman - Barn	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350
NDP-S004b - Chapman - Cottage	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350
NDP-S005 - Eildred	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350
NDP-S006 - Knight - Raunds & Sawyers	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350
NDP-S007 - Knight - Water Lane	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350
NDP-S008 - Keith Carr - Raunds Road	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350
NDP-S013 - JST	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350
NDP-S014 - Allen - Chelston Rise 6-8 houses	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350
NDP-S015 - Craythorn	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350
NDP-S017 - Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - Britten Close	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350
NDP-S018a - Mommersteeg - Caldecott Rd	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350
NDP-S018b - Mommersteeg - Bidwell	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350
NDP-S019a - WPG - Chelston Rise 35 houses	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350
NDP-S019b - WPG - Chelston Rise 70 houses	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350
NDP-S020a - CRE - Renewables	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350
NDP-S020b - CRE - New housing/employment	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350
NDP-S021 - Stuart Carr - Duchy Field	38	52	22	46	64	55	73	350

As the returning officer for the poll conducted between 6th-20th March 2014, I declare that the turnout and votes cast have all been validated. There were no spoilt papers and all votes cast have been included in the totals reported.

Mark Hunter
Clerk to the Parish Council, Chelveston-cum-Caldecott

Q1. How many people are in each age group in your household **Table 9**

Household Size	1	2	3	4	5	6
All households	17	79	35	25	11	2
Just 75+	4	8	0	0	0	0
65-75 and 75+	-	2	-	-	-	-
Just 65-75	4	12	0	0	0	0
Just 60-64	3	4	0	0	0	0
Just 40-59	6	22	0	0	0	0
Just 22-39	0	3	0	0	0	0

Q1. How many people are in each age group in your household **Table 10**

0-4	5-10	11-16	17-21	22-39	40-59	60-64	65-75	75+	Household size
19	18	34	33	69	163	31	52	28	447

Q1. Grouped **Table 11**

0-16	17-39	40-59	60-75+	Household size
71	102	163	111	447

Q2 **How long have you personally lived in the Village** **Table 12**

	0-1 yrs	1-5 yrs	6-15 yrs	16-25 yrs	26-40 yrs	41+ yrs	N/S	Totals
Totals	17	103	92	61	50	18	9	350
NN9 6AB	0	4	14	2	6	4	0	30
NN9 6AD	1	2	5	4	0	2	0	14
NN9 6AE	0	0	1	6	0	1	0	8
NN9 6AF	2	6	0	2	3	0	1	14
NN9 6AG	0	6	1	1	3	0	0	11
NN9 6AH	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	4
NN9 6AJ	1	2	7	10	1	1	0	22
NN9 6AL	4	2	0	2	2	0	0	10
NN9 6AN	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
NN9 6AP	0	4	5	4	8	0	0	21
NN9 6AQ	0	0	5	0	1	0	2	8
NN9 6AR	0	2	6	14	2	6	3	33
NN9 6AS	0	0	1	2	3	1	0	7
NN9 6AT	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	5
NN9 6AU	7	64	0	0	1	0	1	73
NN9 6AW	2	7	15	11	12	0	0	47
NN9 6AX	0	0	4	1	4	1	0	10
NN9 6AY	0	0	9	1	3	0	2	15
NN9 6RA	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	15
Totals	17	103	92	61	50	18	9	350

Post Code	Q3. List the things you most like about living in this Village
AB, AS, AY	Because it is a village & does not want urbanising
AB, AS, AY	Being near the countryside, good neighbours, friendly village
AB, AS, AY	Countryside-fields all around us Quiet
AB, AS, AY	Good areas to walk. Being in the countryside. Good local pub.
AB, AS, AY	Good for commuting. Little crime Tranquil
AB, AS, AY	Heritage - I am the fifth generation of my family to live here
AB, AS, AY	I live in this village of Chelveston because it is a village
AB, AS, AY	Its quiet and rural views and the density of residents
AB, AS, AY	Its ruralness, not to densely populated and quiet most of the time. plenty of places to walk.
AB, AS, AY	Its small, quiet and friendly
AB, AS, AY	Nice location, and plenty of open spaces and greenery.
AB, AS, AY	Peace
AB, AS, AY	Peace and quiet
AB, AS, AY	Peace and quiet Rural
AB, AS, AY	Peaceful & quiet
AB, AS, AY	Peaceful atmosphere,green areas,public footpaths,pub,the snowdrops,the farms, the flowers.
AB, AS, AY	Peaceful, village hall, feel safe
AB, AS, AY	Pleasant surroundings and people. Good road communications.
AB, AS, AY	Quiet with a lot of open green fields
AB, AS, AY	Quiet, rural, not built up and lots of open green spaces.
AB, AS, AY	Quiet,mostly unspoilt with immediate access to the open countryside. I like the fact we have little or no facilities with the exception of the Star and Garter.
AB, AS, AY	Quiet Low crime rate
AB, AS, AY	Quiet No crime
AB, AS, AY	Rural location

Post Code	Q3. List the things you most like about living in this Village
AB, AS, AY	Rural location - surrounded by fields Low percentage of children/teenagers, therefore no gangs congregating in areas Safe
AB, AS, AY	Rural location, small village.
AB, AS, AY	Rural setting
AB, AS, AY	Rural setting
AB, AS, AY	Small and compact but not cramped Wonderful views around the village to the open countryside around Mix of people and house types
AB, AS, AY	Small friendly
AB, AS, AY	Small village with lots of open views of countryside. As I was born and bred in Raunds, I always wanted to live close by but not in a town. People are nice and friendly
AB, AS, AY	Small village with open spaces. Feeling of community. Lovely views of open countryside from all areas of the village
AB, AS, AY	Smaller village, friendly people Nice open views We don't want to turn into a town
AB, AS, AY	SPACE UNLIKE A TOWN & MORE FRIENDLY
AB, AS, AY	The convenient location to towns/city's & fast roads (A14/M1/A1) 'Our' specific location within the village The fields that surround the village
AB, AS, AY	The location of our house in the village & views Convenience to main towns MK, Cambridge, Peterboro & main roads/motorways The open fields around the village
AB, AS, AY	The open fields and no built up areas. Also Adrian Dale cares so much about the village which is good. I love living here!
AB, AS, AY	The rural aspect. The small friendly community
AB, AS, AY	The rural aspect Being a quiet location but close to good transport links
AB, AS, AY	Tranquility Sense of community created by newsletter + church functions
AB, AS, AY	Usual village life
AB, AS, AY	VILLAGE LIFE AND MOST OF THE PEOPLE IN IT .

Post Code	Q3. List the things you most like about living in this Village
AB, AS, AY	With the exception of the main road it is quiet & rural
AB, AS, AY	You 'know' most of the people
AD, AE	Chelveston is a relatively small unspoilt village surrounded by beautiful countryside. Not over populated
AD, AE	Countryside views
AD, AE	it is small and quiet surrounded by countryside with plenty of good walks. Easy access to major road networks by car. lots of village activity in village hall - all very welcoming.
AD, AE	It's nice and quiet, friendly people. To be kept as a village not over crowded
AD, AE	peace and quiet and not too overcrowded
AD, AE	Peace quiet & near to countryside
AD, AE	Quiet (except main roads) Access to major roads Friendly Pub Good Parish Council
AD, AE	Quiet countryside
AD, AE	Quiet Location. Village with mains gas. Good access to main road network.
AD, AE	Quiet village with sense of community
AD, AE	Quiet, friendly Active Parish Council Open views Pub
AD, AE	Small and quiet, surrounded by plenty of good walks. Easy access to major road network.
AD, AE	The quiet Countryside The views from my house especially across the fields
AD, AE	The village is quiet calm and personal. That's why we moved here
AD, AE	The village should stay a village & not develop into a town
AD, AE	The village should stay a village & not develop into a town
AD, AE	The village should stay a village and not develop into a town
AF, AG, AP	Easy access
AF, AG, AP	Everything

Post Code	Q3. List the things you most like about living in this Village
AF, AG, AP	Excellent Pub, nice friendly crowd. Nice walks around the village, very peaceful. Friendly community. Excellent Parish Council, no complaints. The village is a good size, not too much traffic flow. Very low crime rate, if any at all.
AF, AG, AP	Friendly village atmosphere
AF, AG, AP	Good neighbours
AF, AG, AP	Good size for a village with social activities if you want them. Excellent countryside with good footpaths, local pub is great meeting place.
AF, AG, AP	I like its size ,although i preferred it when i was a child because it was half the size it is now.
AF, AG, AP	I like the open countryside and the feeling of space. I like living in a small village where you can meet people.
AF, AG, AP	It is a small unique and friendly village.
AF, AG, AP	My house, no problems with other residents. The village is clean, tidy and feels safe. Excellent Parish Council, Good location, early bin collection
AF, AG, AP	Nice quiet small village
AF, AG, AP	Nice quiet village
AF, AG, AP	Peace and quiet, natural environments for wildlife Country living, lovely views Friendliness & community feel of a small village
AF, AG, AP	Peaceful and British
AF, AG, AP	Peaceful. Small Vaillage. Neighbouring Countryside
AF, AG, AP	Peaceful People
AF, AG, AP	Pease and tranquility, the neighbours.
AF, AG, AP	People church pub singing
AF, AG, AP	Pub
AF, AG, AP	Pub
AF, AG, AP	Pub
AF, AG, AP	Qualityof life. Not over housed and populated. Community spirit
AF, AG, AP	quiet easy reach of lots of main towns
AF, AG, AP	Quiet location, no random parking outside house
AF, AG, AP	Quiet location. Great for walking with open spaces. Easy access but separated from local towns

Post Code	Q3. List the things you most like about living in this Village
AF, AG, AP	Quiet location. Easy to get to lots of places
AF, AG, AP	Quiet, friendly and rural feel Mix of housing types
AF, AG, AP	Sense of community, great friendly neighbours Being in the countryside Peace and quiet
AF, AG, AP	Sense of community, peace and quiet, surrounding fields.
AF, AG, AP	Small friendly community. Local people that want to live in and invest in the local area long-term. Beautiful views
AF, AG, AP	Small village atmosphere
AF, AG, AP	Supportive & delightful neighbours. Being surrounded by countryside whilst being close to a variety of excellent shopping facilities. We are also a reasonable distance from London with excellent road & transport facilities - once you get out of the village.
AF, AG, AP	The fact that it is still a village.
AF, AG, AP	the location with easy access to fields and walks. The size of the village enabling a good cross section of people to reside.
AF, AG, AP	The peace and quiet The community spirit
AF, AG, AP	The people, - church - WI and singing
AF, AG, AP	The pub
AF, AG, AP	The pub
AF, AG, AP	The quiet life an community spirit Walks in the country side around the village The local pub
AF, AG, AP	The rural aspect of the village
AF, AG, AP	The sense of community, the size, the network of footpaths and the proximity to nearby towns whilst at the same time having a 2 mile buffer from them
AF, AG, AP	The village community spirit, the right of way footpaths for walks and the brook running through the village
AF, AG, AP	Very little
AF, AG, AP	Views and open spaces Community feel
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Access to countryside
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Access to open countryside, low crime, village life.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Because it is not overpopulated and nice and quiet and peaceful. It also has a thriving public house.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Because it's small and quiet
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Community

Post Code	Q3. List the things you most like about living in this Village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Community spirit and that it really is a village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Countryside and rural aspects Accessability - roads, motorways and trains
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	countryside, safe environment and friendly neighbours.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Freedom of the surrounding countryside
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Friendliness
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Friendliness community spirit
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Friendly community and pub with good value meals. Active and well kept church and churchyard. Well run Parish Council.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Friendly people, quiet location
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Friendly people, quiet settings
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	I adore the peace and quiet of the village, the fantastic views from our property and the village way of life
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Its general quietness and friendly atmosphere among residents
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	lovely pub friendly people nice and quiet
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Nice friendly community
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Nice small quiet village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Open countryside the public house the diverse ages of inhabitants
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Peace and quiet - very few houses
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Peace and quiet/decent pub Living in a small community Taking part in the singing group/parish meetings
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	peaceful church, pub , people.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Proximity to open countryside, but quite convenient for shopping etc.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Quiet, peaceful countryside feel, friendly people
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Quiet Access to countryside
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Quiet Pub
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Quietness , solitude , beautiful countryside, nice welcoming people

Post Code	Q3. List the things you most like about living in this Village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Rural aspects Access to numerous footpaths Country living with good access to major town/cities by road and rail
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Rural location
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Rural location. Countryside views. Community feel. Friendly pub. Small size
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Rural village with a good pub and church.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Rural.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Sense of community Pub
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Size, rural proximity to towns, good for commuting
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Small friendly community and good well run pub Well run parish council works hard for benefit of residents Well maintained church/curchyard
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	small quiet and friendly
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	small quiet community offers the of village life !pub church + village hallofffer chances to interact with other residents+learn more about the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Small quiet village with low crime rates.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Small village with the ability to live a quiet life with low crime rates.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Small, quiet, friendly
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	The fact that it is a village and not a town.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	The fact that it is a village and not a town.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	The fact that it is a village.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	The open countryside
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	the rural location
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Traditional English village Friendly residents Communal spirit
AQ, AW	Being surrounded by fields
AQ, AW	Community, quiet location, village pub, good links to major roads / motorways for work.
AQ, AW	Country views, peaceful, village feel community
AQ, AW	Countryside Friendly people

Post Code	Q3. List the things you most like about living in this Village
AQ, AW	Family are here Pub Friendly Safe
AQ, AW	Friendly atmosphere, peaceful, quiet
AQ, AW	Friendly rural community Open countryside
AQ, AW	I like that Chelveston is a small village with a supportive community. Traffic is light as there are no major roads.
AQ, AW	I like the size of the village and the fact that it retains its rural identity whilst being in proximity to larger towns and villages.
AQ, AW	It is a nice small village. It has always been a safe area. It is lovely and quiet
AQ, AW	It is nice an quiet and not over populated that is why I live here.
AQ, AW	It's my home
AQ, AW	It`s community spirit, small countryside village.
AQ, AW	Lack of traffic.
AQ, AW	location small villagecommunity feel limited number of residence
AQ, AW	Location, rural outlook, good friend`s and neighbours, pub.
AQ, AW	Open spaces
AQ, AW	Open views - quiet
AQ, AW	Peaceful ,safe, friendly people.
AQ, AW	Peaceful. Very little traffic going past our house. The countryside views. The open spaces. Friendly neighbours. The village 'feel'. A lot of people have lived here a long time.
AQ, AW	people, small country village feel. pub church
AQ, AW	Pub, footpaths, quiet, friendly people
AQ, AW	Quiet
AQ, AW	Quiet and friendly
AQ, AW	Quiet and peaceful, but with reasonable access to shopping etc. We have a very good Parish Council which looks after our needs.
AQ, AW	Quiet location, village feel. Low development
AQ, AW	Quiet unspoilt village
AQ, AW	Quiet village Surrounding countryside Safe for children to play
AQ, AW	Quiet, friendly people, good neighbours, rural, no major developments ruining the character of village.

Post Code	Q3. List the things you most like about living in this Village
AQ, AW	Quiet, friendly village Safe
AQ, AW	Quiet, good community, convenient road links. Amazing parish council!
AQ, AW	Quiet. Rural situation. Housing variety
AQ, AW	Quietness and peaceful
AQ, AW	Quietness, community, countryside, spread and character of village.
AQ, AW	Relatively unspoilt countryside (until CRE proposal was approved....)
AQ, AW	Rural - quiet
AQ, AW	Rural aspect, size (not too large)
AQ, AW	Rural location quiet spot
AQ, AW	Sense of community- we have been made to feel very welcome. Good footpaths
AQ, AW	Small and friendly The Pub The People
AQ, AW	Small quiet peaceful village. Friendly neighbours open fields
AQ, AW	Small village peaceful
AQ, AW	Small village, no traffic, quiet.
AQ, AW	Small, peaceful, safe, hardly any crime
AQ, AW	Surrounding countryside
AQ, AW	The existing size, development and position within the countryside The existing mixture in the community and the tranquillity and closeness to nature
AQ, AW	The peace and quiet.
AQ, AW	The peace and quite open spaces for dog walking and recreation
AQ, AW	The quietness of the village, neighbours are friendly, the surrounding areas are also quiet and is far enough away from a town but close enough for amenities.
AQ, AW	The quietness Location not too far from local shops
AQ, AW	The size and location. We purchased our house for its rural location
AQ, AW	The size means it still feels like a village. The properties are a good size, not too small or too large. Mostly I like that it feels rural & is surrounded by open countryside
AQ, AW	The size(not too big)

Post Code	Q3. List the things you most like about living in this Village
AR, AT	1. Quiet and peaceful 2. Friendly neighbours 3. Surrounding by open countryside, but not isolated.
AR, AT	Access & convenience
AR, AT	Caldecott. It is small. There are no street lights, few paths and the village is really in the countryside
AR, AT	How quiet it is, amount of people living here, isn't overcrowded, Good community spirit
AR, AT	I like the feeling of community. As the village is still quite small it still retains that feeling. I like the fact that it is rural but also not too far away from a larger settlement(s) ie: Higham Ferrers and Raunds.
AR, AT	I love the countryside and the peace. The community spirit. the wildlife. The natural beauty of it all
AR, AT	I really enjoy the peace and quiet of the village as well as the open countryside. I like the historical side of the village too.
AR, AT	its peacefulness and being able to hear the birds sing.having an out look onto greenfields and trees.
AR, AT	its rural enviroment!
AR, AT	Its small and quiet with friendly neighbours.
AR, AT	Peace and quiet
AR, AT	Peacefulness Community spirit Outlook-fields, trees etc
AR, AT	Pub & a pleasant community Very accesible road & rail links
AR, AT	Quiet and peacefull.
AR, AT	Quiet rural
AR, AT	quiet rural location
AR, AT	Quiet rural location, buildings such as church, village hall. Pro-active Parish Council
AR, AT	Quiet rural loction
AR, AT	Quiet rural setting
AR, AT	Quiet, rural feel but within short drive of town and local amenities.
AR, AT	rural location
AR, AT	Small community and not too built up. Other villages have expanded too quickly (Brixworth is an example of this). I like the fact that I can walk out straight into the countryside and country lanes.
AR, AT	Small village.Quiet location.Everyone knows each other.Open countryside.Good community spirit.
AR, AT	The fact that it is small, there isn't much going on so its quiet, and i know all the people who live around me.
AR, AT	the green open space ,nice views, perfect playing in when a child.the quietness how picturesque it is
AR, AT	The local pub and the rural location with limited light pollution
AR, AT	The peace and quiet. Not too much traffic. Rural feeling but a short drive to town. The church bells ringing.

Post Code	Q3. List the things you most like about living in this Village
AR, AT	Unspoilt views, trees and hedges. Views over the church and its grounds. Peaceful
AU	Calmness and sounds of the countryside, wildlife etc
AU	Chelston Rise is a unique development which is peaceful, quiet, largely unspoilt without a high density of housing, but still retaining a community spirit. The surrounding roads are not too busy, and this helps make the whole area really safe, especially for families with children.
AU	Community - everybody knows everybody Security - knowing neighbours are looking after interests Family Tranquility with plenty of green areas
AU	Country life style Open space Quiet Wildlife
AU	Countryside
AU	Countryside, peace and quite, freindly neighbours
AU	Fewer residential properties. Peace, tranquility and views reduced transport/vehicles than the towns
AU	Friendly people & lovely views
AU	history peace and quiet
AU	I have moved from a town and do not wish to see the countryside the friendliness of the community spoilt
AU	I like quiet, peaceful nature & the amount of open countryside
AU	I lived in a town with noise and trouble. Out here I love the countryside views, the quietness and friendliness of the community.
AU	i love the openness, the countryside feel, the space, the peace and quiet. the whole village feel. we moved here because it was open, with lots of space for the kids to grow into. it is safe
AU	I moved from a town & do not wish the countryside & quietness spoilt
AU	It is quiet and peaceful.
AU	It is quiet, peaceful & away from busy roads etc, & there are lovely countryside views
AU	It is quiet Nice views Friendly neighbours Safe for the children to play outside

Post Code	Q3. List the things you most like about living in this Village
AU	It's natural & peaceful
AU	It's quiet, the neighbours are lovely and it's away from the busy life style I had to endure at work
AU	Its open feel and the low amounts of traffic and congestion.
AU	Limited households - everybody knows everyone Sense of small, personal community Family safety Tranquility with plenty of green belt
AU	Location in respect to local towns. Access to childrens play area and green areas.
AU	Low head count. Peaceful & quiet location. Low crime rate
AU	Nice & peaceful, close to town for shops but still a village
AU	Nice quiet little village, not too much traffic, open rural landscape, friendly community great location
AU	Open countryside an abundance of wildlife peacefull views
AU	Open fields surroundings, quiet, not densley populated,no through traffic in the crescent.
AU	Peace and quiet
AU	Peace and quiet, although not to much of that, since renewable energy have turned up. Having no amennities, and being part of a small community.
AU	peace and quiet,small community, view from our window
AU	Peaceful countryside, the absence of shops and business but nearness of town and facilities when needed. Friendly people
AU	Peaceful in the area
AU	Peaceful, friendly atmosphere
AU	Peaceful, great views, rural location, no amenities. Not developed.
AU	Peaceful, quiet, friendly environment
AU	Quiet and tranquil village
AU	Quiet countryside Good walks
AU	Quiet location
AU	Quiet no trouble. A friendly community
AU	Quiet, friendly
AU	Quiet, friendly, safe, clean, rural with easy access to open countryside for walking and riding. Close proximity to nature and fresh air. Views of open fields.
AU	Quiet, open countryside, not built up. Pub walking distance + friendly

Post Code	Q3. List the things you most like about living in this Village
AU	Quiet, rural location, small friendly community
AU	Quiet, rural, open spaces, friendly. Gives you room.
AU	QUIET, SECLUDED AREA. LACK OF CRIME. NOT BUILT UP.
AU	Quiet Good sense of community spirit Pub
AU	Quietness, open fields, countryside.
AU	Remote Easy access to footpaths, trails, to go for walks Undisturbed Safe for children
AU	Rural countryside, peace and quiet, low car volumes
AU	Rural location, unspoilt village
AU	Small community and the peace and quiet of the country.
AU	Small community Quiet rural area A calmer way of life
AU	Small, relaxed, safe & peaceful
AU	Space, peaceful, quiet, safe.
AU	The Country side
AU	The countryside, safe for the children
AU	The fact that it is a village not a town. Too many new houses would spoil this and so would too many lorries going to the anaerobic digestion plant.
AU	The openness, the peacefulness, the fact that we are in open countryside, the wildlife(deer, badgers, foxes, kites and buzzards)
AU	The peace & quiet, not much of that since renewable energy has turned up, being part of a small community
AU	The peace & quiet The friendliness of the people The lack of shops & businesses
AU	the quiet and seclusion of the area .
AU	The quiet rural setting.

Post Code	Q3. List the things you most like about living in this Village
AU	The quietness, politeness of neighbours
AU	the quietness. the countryside feel. the big green open spaces. the village feel, the village life
AU	the serenity and peacefulness. Being part of small built community. The 'unspoilt' countryside
AU	Very peaceful in the country

Post Code	Q4 - List the things you least like about living in this Village
AB, AS, AY	Extra traffic
AB, AS, AY	Irresponsible parking and excessive dog fouling.
AB, AS, AY	JST and the heavy traffic along the Raunds Road
AB, AS, AY	Lack of a shop
AB, AS, AY	Lack of footpath / cycle path to Raunds and Higham Ferrers. Lack of average speed cameras to keep traffic to a sensible speed through village.
AB, AS, AY	Lack of public transport links to larger towns, the speed at which people go through village on Raunds road. No footpaths to joining towns or Chelston Rise.
AB, AS, AY	Lack of safe cycling routes
AB, AS, AY	Less attractive than most with few of the activities experienced in more desirable villages. Built around faster roads with ever increasing traffic. Could be better maintained pride in public places
AB, AS, AY	Little community spirit
AB, AS, AY	No local shop for essentials
AB, AS, AY	No public transport. No shop. Ageing population who will find problems if they cannot drive.
AB, AS, AY	No public transport
AB, AS, AY	No shop
AB, AS, AY	No shop
AB, AS, AY	No shop, playground, footpath to Raunds, bus and no children
AB, AS, AY	No shop. Would be good for meeting other villagers and enhance community spirit on a daily basis.
AB, AS, AY	No small local shop
AB, AS, AY	No village shop
AB, AS, AY	Noisy Raunds Road especially during rush hours am & pm
AB, AS, AY	Not having a 'corner shop' but no great hardship. Still a lovely village
AB, AS, AY	Not having a shop
AB, AS, AY	Not having a shop or post office
AB, AS, AY	PEOPLE WHO WANT TO BUILD ON GARDENS, PARKING FOOTPATHS , SPEEDING TRAFIC
AB, AS, AY	seed of traffic
AB, AS, AY	Selective sense of community. Community events often on weekdays during the day. Lack of village shop.
AB, AS, AY	Some homes for young people
AB, AS, AY	Speed of traffic through the village and excessive motorbike noise
AB, AS, AY	speed of traffic through village
AB, AS, AY	Speeding on the roads into the village Cars parked on the pavements and on the Road outside Poka's cottages

Post Code	Q4 - List the things you least like about living in this Village
AB, AS, AY	SPEEDING TRAFFIC
AB, AS, AY	The amount of speeding through traffic
AB, AS, AY	The creeping industrialisation of the Airfield, turning an open space into an industrial site.
AB, AS, AY	The fast traffic
AB, AS, AY	The increasingly busy main Raunds Road Unable to negotiate pavements due to parked cars
AB, AS, AY	The convenient location to towns/city's & fast roads (A14/M1/A1) 'Our' specific location within the village The fields that surround the village
AB, AS, AY	Too much speeding traffic
AB, AS, AY	Traffic & windmills
AB, AS, AY	Traffic on Raunds Road speeding
AB, AS, AY	TRAFFIC! In the 7 odd years we have been here I would say it has got worse year by year. Also I don't think the village is particularly pretty.
AB, AS, AY	Wind farm, amount of traffic using Raunds Road
AB, AS, AY	Windmills
AB, AS, AY	Would be nice to have a shop
AB, AS, AY	Would be nice to have a village shop (open during daylight only though)
AD, AE	All the changes that are being made. Village needs to be kept a village. No cheap housing for the young people who have to move further afield
AD, AE	Cars using the minor roads as a short cut from Raunds or Higham.
AD, AE	Lack of facilities
AD, AE	Lack of facilities for children
AD, AE	Lack of pathways to nearest towns No local shop Traffic on Raunds Road, speeding
AD, AE	No public transport and no local shop therefore need to use the car for all journeys.
AD, AE	No public transport and no local shop. Car therefore needed for all journeys. Lots of village activities in village hall.

Post Code	Q4 - List the things you least like about living in this Village
AD, AE	No public transport or shop No children's play area
AD, AE	No public transport The traffic on Raunds Road - Kimbolton Road namely cars parked obstructing oncoming traffic flow. Sawyers Crescent traffic - it should be made one way only
AD, AE	Nothing
AD, AE	Nothing - love it!
AD, AE	The development plans
AD, AE	The development plans
AD, AE	Threat of flooding in Water Lane together with this lane being used as a rat run for through traffic
AD, AE	Threat of flooding Traffic through Water Lane as a rat run
AD, AE	Traffic speeding No pathways to local towns Lack of facilities for children/teens Lack of bus service
AF, AG, AP	"Rat Run" traffic on B663. Lack of car parking, lack of off road parking.
AF, AG, AP	All the changes the village is trying to do
AF, AG, AP	Cats
AF, AG, AP	Do not want large developments which will totally spoil this wonderful village. Speeding vehicles from Raunds and Higham. A bus service on a Friday to help people do their shopping
AF, AG, AP	Doesn't feel safe cycling on the roads round here. Have to drive to shops . Footpaths are uninspiring
AF, AG, AP	Generally satisfied with this very pleasant rural setting Maybe a regular bus service would be something to think about, maybe twice a week
AF, AG, AP	Having to travel to the nearest shop
AF, AG, AP	I dislike the look of the turbines and the constant threat of more development in this area.
AF, AG, AP	Lack of a shop. Bus service
AF, AG, AP	Lack of amenities
AF, AG, AP	Lack of amenities
AF, AG, AP	Lack of off street parking
AF, AG, AP	Lack of public transport
AF, AG, AP	Lack of public transport & a shop

Post Code	Q4 - List the things you least like about living in this Village
AF, AG, AP	Lack of support from so many people and CATS!(in my garden)
AF, AG, AP	Lack of village shop/post office
AF, AG, AP	Need a car, will have to move if unable to drive
AF, AG, AP	No bus service & no railway station at Higham Ferrers!
AF, AG, AP	No facilities, ie shop, post office, chemist No bus service to major towns
AF, AG, AP	No play park amenities
AF, AG, AP	no shop no public transport
AF, AG, AP	No shop Adrian Dale (I jest of course)
AF, AG, AP	No Shop No transport
AF, AG, AP	Not being able to get to railway stations or other villages using buses on Saturdays.
AF, AG, AP	Not too many drawbacks
AF, AG, AP	Nothing at the moment
AF, AG, AP	Some of planning horrors in the past. The problems with parking Speeding The loss of the airfield amenity
AF, AG, AP	Speed of traffic at peak times
AF, AG, AP	Speeding cars.
AF, AG, AP	Speeding through Water Lane by people cutting through, lack of shop, lack of playground.
AF, AG, AP	Speeding traffic
AF, AG, AP	the ever growing plans of CRE to totally change the countryside. Dangerous road junctions caused by poor car parking. Very busy roads - short cuts for commuters
AF, AG, AP	The eyesore of JST opposite the memorial & in the centre of our village The turbines which look massive when one walks or drives up Water Lane
AF, AG, AP	The increasing amounts of traffic which now uses the B645, especially the increased risk at the junction with Ralings Road/The Green due to drivers not considering pedestgrians.
AF, AG, AP	the talk of development.
AF, AG, AP	The threat of developers changing the nature of village life. Irreversable
AF, AG, AP	The village hall needs to be modernized and larger, I know this is happening anyway so its ok.

Post Code	Q4 - List the things you least like about living in this Village
AF, AG, AP	Unable to comment
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	1. Lack of a real centre to the village 2. Mixture of housing and commercial/industrial activities; commercial developments too close to residential properties 3. Speeding traffic through the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Amount of traffic passing through, Wind Turbines.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Better public transport, more average family housing 2-4 bed rooms a shop would be nice
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Busy road through. Speeding traffic. I think traffic calming would be a good thing for investigate.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Cars that park illegally/inconsideratly on Raunds Rd/High Street The speed that some farm vehicles and/ or machinery goes through the village People that live in the village who have driven their cars to the pub then after a few hours of drinking drive home.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	concerned about the amount of traffic now using chelveston as a short cut to the A6. Could we have traffic calming in place on the b645 to help speeding traffic
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Constant traffic, no shop.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Could do with a shop.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Dangerous drivers, no shop or other amenities
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Having a forklift business at its heart
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	I can't think of anything I least like about the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	JST!! (not so small, quiet or friendly to the environment)
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	just fork lift truck site not a good street scene
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Lack of a small shop
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Lack of a small shop.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Lack of local shops
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Lack of parking
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Little community spirit evident - no centre to village life. Lack of buses, shop, travelling library etc.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Motor bikes in pub
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	No public transport
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	no regular bus service to any where no footpaths linking caldicott to chelston rise /chelveston to raunds
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	No shop
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	No shop or facilities - have to travel to do anything
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	No shop or playground/ facilities for children
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	No shop,lack of public transport

Post Code	Q4 - List the things you least like about living in this Village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	No shop No parking
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	no traffic calming no safe places to cross the roads
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	No village shop Lack of safety on road (corner to Disbrowe Court)
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	None I can think of
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Nothing negative to say
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Parking
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Parking problem in the heart of the village. Mad traffic coming blindly round the corner of B645/B663. No safe path to either Raunds/Higham for pedestrians/cyclists
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	proximity of wind farm.lack of public transport no shop/parcel facilities
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	public transport lacking
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Speeding Traffic
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	speeding traffic
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Speeding traffic No parking bays
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	The fact that people use it as a dormitory village and quite a few people can't even pass the time of day with you
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	The speeding issues on the roads.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Traffic is getting bad
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Traffic problems for residents by the Green
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Traffic speeding through the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Traffic, JST site
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Wind Farm. Bikers. Busy Road. Garage
AQ, AW	Cannot think of any!
AQ, AW	CRE
AQ, AW	dog mess on footpaths, no shop, no village 'heart'- church too far from Chelveston. Busy main road and speeding cars.
AQ, AW	Greed of residents wanting to build on residential properties
AQ, AW	In the 31 years I have lived here I have had 2 cars stolen, plus recently the catalytic converter was stolen from my car.
AQ, AW	Irresponsible dog owners soiling the pathways.

Post Code	Q4 - List the things you least like about living in this Village
AQ, AW	JST not in keeping with the village Parking, any new developments should have adequate parking for vehicles. Traffic through the village and speed
AQ, AW	Lack of facilities means a journey in the car every time. No facilities for children
AQ, AW	Lack of older character properties Traffic through B645/B663
AQ, AW	Lack of regular public transport Rat run between Raunds and the A6/A45 Motorbike weekends The energy park
AQ, AW	Lack of traffic calming B645 is dangerous to cross as traffic especially from Foot Lane to the pub. Traffic comes from 3 directions at speed.
AQ, AW	Main road
AQ, AW	No `local` shop, no public transport.
AQ, AW	no bus no parking no shop no doctors
AQ, AW	No bus route (for teenagers)Wind turbines
AQ, AW	No bus service. Walking into Raunds or Stanwick is difficult.
AQ, AW	No footpath to Raunds / Higham Ferrers.
AQ, AW	No Post Office, No public transport.
AQ, AW	no post office. no shop
AQ, AW	No public transport
AQ, AW	No public transport links, no shop
AQ, AW	No public transport/shops
AQ, AW	No public transport Shortage of cycle ways
AQ, AW	No shop and constantly looking at dog foul whilst out walking my dogs witch i am responsible for .
AQ, AW	No shop within walking distance. No footpaths to Raunds or Higham.
AQ, AW	No shop, no community groups eg playgroup, no 'centre' or focus, no transport links. No Connections between Caldecott, Chelston Rise or Chelveston
AQ, AW	No shop.
AQ, AW	No shops, no transport

Post Code	Q4 - List the things you least like about living in this Village
AQ, AW	Nothing
AQ, AW	Parking problems Speeding vehicles on B645
AQ, AW	Speeding traffic in particular weekend motor bikes, making crossing the road at particular times quite dangerous. Parking of vehicles and dangers caused by these at central village junctions
AQ, AW	The eyesore that is JST forklifts
AQ, AW	The fact that it does not have a shop but I can live with it
AQ, AW	The fact that there is no shop and footpaths adjoining the surrounding towns.
AQ, AW	The lack of paths to safely walk with a pram. The lack of safe crossing points on the main road. The distance to travel to the nearest shop.
AQ, AW	The main road that goes through the village
AQ, AW	The prospect of mass development. Bio Mass CRE
AQ, AW	The windmills People using Water Lane as a rat run
AQ, AW	There are few places to walk with children that are safe, such as limited available path spaces, There is no available green space for children such as a small park There are no amenities in the village such as a small shop
AQ, AW	There is nothing I dislike.
AQ, AW	traffic too fast on water lane, main road, sawyers crescent, raunds rd. please address this first. No paths to walk to Higham. Dog mess!
AQ, AW	Turbines/windmills
AQ, AW	Unable to walk or cycle anywhere as roads too busy.
AQ, AW	Unkept gardens spoil the overall of the village
AQ, AW	Untidy front gardens Village looks tired and unkempt
AQ, AW	water lane cut through to raunds road
AQ, AW	Wind farm and energy park No buses No footpaths to Higham or Stanwick and Raunds
AQ, AW	Windmills - energy farm Lack of footpaths joining anywhere else
AR, AT	1. Volume and speed of traffic 2. Deelopment and industrialisation of former airfield site.

Post Code	Q4 - List the things you least like about living in this Village
AR, AT	Caldecott. Traffic increase on road since new development at Chelston Rise and other sites. Loss of the airfield site - now filling up with industry
AR, AT	chelveston renewable energy park
AR, AT	CRE developments Development of Chelston Rise Forklift Truck Centre obtrusive industrial area in centre of village
AR, AT	CRE park on airfield
AR, AT	hard to get any where if you cant drive , buses etc. no convenience store.
AR, AT	Increasing amount of speeding traffic and service vehicles going through the village up onto the airfield. Also, the ever increasing industrial developments nearby.
AR, AT	Interfering busybodies
AR, AT	no corner shop, no bus stop (hard for the younger ages who cannot drive)
AR, AT	No regular bus service
AR, AT	Nothing
AR, AT	Nothing
AR, AT	Public transport is limited which makes it difficult for the younger/older generations to get about.
AR, AT	Sorry to have to say this but the close proximity of the wind turbines! Also, a lot of people have lived here a long time and are not so open to new people or change.
AR, AT	speeding traffic-this is a major concern for.
AR, AT	The distance from the nearest food shop.
AR, AT	the impact that the increase in traffic from the re opening of the american base as chelston rise plus the traffic involved with occupation on the airfield. allhave contributed to a very busy roud from fist light till very late at night with its associated noise and vibration
AR, AT	The increase in traffic and the speed of same. The CRE park on the airfield
AR, AT	The wind farm
AR, AT	Too much traffic using as a short cut at great speed
AR, AT	Traffic coming through
AR, AT	Traffic numbers are growing and restrictions must be considered Peripheral development spoiling the look of the village
AR, AT	Traffic, especially large vehicles and m'bikes JST and their lack of consideration towards the village
AR, AT	Traffic, Lorries turning up village lanes. Speed trasffic travels through village.

Post Code	Q4 - List the things you least like about living in this Village
AR, AT	Traffic Residential & industrial developments on former airfield site
AR, AT	Wind farm (visible in winter only) and speeding traffic
AU	(Dependent on car) None?
AU	A lot of people seem to want to build around the area, spoiling the views & the rural aspect. It would be nice to have more footpaths
AU	All the lorries ruining the roads. They weren't built for 29 ton lorries. There should be a weight limit through the village.
AU	Being looked down upon when passing residents that have been in the village longer than us one person especially is very bad at this and happens to be a councillor
AU	Chelveston Renewable Energy. The damage of the roads.
AU	Fast and heavy traffic
AU	Fast through traffic
AU	Heavy traffic through the villages . the constant uncertainty with chelveston renewable energy . how they seem intent on industrialising the area.
AU	Increased traffic due to renewable energy park windfarm.
AU	Lack of children for localisation of own child.
AU	Lack of connecting pathway between Chelston Rise, Caldecott and Chelveston. No speed restriction from Chelston Rise to Caldecott.
AU	lack of convenience store
AU	Lack of facilities, especially for children
AU	looking at wind turbines, constantly fighting for a quiet life
AU	No footpaths down to the village
AU	No local shop, lack of public transport links. not everybody drives, and sometimes i like to take a day off from driving
AU	No path from Chelston Rise to the village. The large lorries that use the roads for the re-cycling plant
AU	No paths from village to village.
AU	No shop and no bus service
AU	No shop. No path from Cheslton Rise to Caldecott.
AU	No small general stores No footpath from Chelston Rise to Caldecott or to Higham Ferrers
AU	Not having a local store

Post Code	Q4 - List the things you least like about living in this Village
AU	Nothing
AU	Nothing
AU	Nothing
AU	Nothing
AU	Nothing
AU	Nothing
AU	Nothing
AU	Nothing
AU	Nothing - it's perfect just the way it is. Burning manure piles!!
AU	Nothing except the expansion of residential property too fast and too many
AU	Nothing, it's perfect
AU	Parking spaces.
AU	Poor bus facilities, no village shop, no youth club for children
AU	Poor services
AU	Slow broadband
AU	Slow internet
AU	small community
AU	The amount of lorries that pass by, and the amount of traffic in and out of the airfield.
AU	The attitude of some of the village residents to people who have not lived here all there lives. A lot of negative comments are made and I feel that we are looked at as outsiders and not wanted in the area.
AU	The fact that it doesn't have a high street & that internet speeds are very poor, despite BT Infinity being available from the Raunds exchange
AU	the lack of public transport
AU	The new waste plant Wind farm/turbines Lorries speeding through village Workers speeding through village to get to airfield complex
AU	The road is totally worn out Wind Farm traffic
AU	The roads could do with some repairs
AU	The state of the roads, caused by the amount of lorries.
AU	The uncertainty of future planning proposals at Chelveston. Renewable Energy Park. The intent of persons to detrimentally affect the rural setting.

Post Code	Q4 - List the things you least like about living in this Village
AU	The windfarm.
AU	There aren't any. If there was I wouldn't have moved here in the first place
AU	There is no path way between Chelston Rise & Caldecott No local shop
AU	There is no shop in walking distance No path from Chelston Rise to Caldecott
AU	There is nothing I dislike To me it is the perfect place to live
AU	Too many lorries
AU	Wind turbines. The spectre of industry/housing I bulk arriving
AU	Wind turbines/farm Additional noisy traffic created by new development airfield Speeding of outsiders who work near village Waste plant
AU	Windmills, lack of control over growth on Airfield. Energy Park. WGP development plans.
AU	WINDMILLS SOLAR FARM ALL OF THE SUDDEN DEVELOPMENTAL CHANGES.
AU	You have to drive to reach even a corner shop

Post Code	Q5 - What sort of Village would you like Chelveston-cum-Caldecott to be in 20 years time?
AB, AS, AY	15% growth maximum (say 20 dwellings) More bungalows/less 4 bed houses To stay static whilst main housing growth is confined to nearby towns Rushden etc
AB, AS, AY	A small increase in size of village by about 20 dwellings. Absolutely not into current green field sites. Just not necessary with number of available areas proposed by lanlords
AB, AS, AY	A small thriving village
AB, AS, AY	A thriving small village
AB, AS, AY	A village much as its currently
AB, AS, AY	A village that people like living in & use
AB, AS, AY	About ten percent larger, with an adequate supply of affordable homes. Currently, the majority of residents are of the 'older' age group....having more affordable homes available for the youngsters would reduce the overall age level.
AB, AS, AY	Better mix of smaller houses and bungalows to try and ensure a wider age mix but this would require better facilities which are not in the proposal. A new village hall is not required as the current one, when refurbished, is more than adequate
AB, AS, AY	Child friendly,public transport for elderly and non drivers,still retain peaceful countryside atmosphere, any expansion should be done to match existing infrastructure and not too much expansion to keep village not small town.
AB, AS, AY	Family village no factories etc
AB, AS, AY	Good mix young and retired residents
AB, AS, AY	I don't know because I will be up the churchyard 6 feet under
AB, AS, AY	I like it just as it is now. In an ideal world I would like a lot less traffic coming through and at a lower speed. i do feel if JST was gone it would make the village look nicer but that would depend on the type of housing that would be built on the site and if people looked after their properties (i.e. private housing)
AB, AS, AY	I like the current size of the village so I would not want to see it increase in overall size. I think it would make the village less attractive if the open approaches to the village were filled in with houses. I do not see the point of filling the village with more large deluxe houses as we seem to have plenty of these and to build more would just be to line the pockets of the builders/land owners. I would like to see traffic calming put in place. It is good to have a village pub but I do not think we can support shops.
AB, AS, AY	I like the village as it is now but realise there should be modest development
AB, AS, AY	I will not survive this long

Post Code	Q5 - What sort of Village would you like Chelveston-cum-Caldecott to be in 20 years time?
AB, AS, AY	I would like to keep the village on the small size, as there is lots of development in the pipeline for Raunds, Higham and Rushden Let's keep it a small village please
AB, AS, AY	I would like to see some affordable housing for young people especially those who live in the village and would like their own property here. I think we need a mix housing so some more bungalows
AB, AS, AY	I'm 83 yrs old!!
AB, AS, AY	More of a community feel. Street events etc, otherwise v happy with how it is at present. A range of ages would help the future of the village to continue.
AB, AS, AY	More younger people. Affordable housing and single storey homes for people to downsize or entry level.
AB, AS, AY	much the same a regular bus service and village shop
AB, AS, AY	Much the same A village shop and a regular bus service
AB, AS, AY	Needs a range of ages and residents A village shop would be useful
AB, AS, AY	NON MORE THAN TEN PER CENT BIGGER .
AB, AS, AY	Not much bigger than now. Growth that happens to address housing opportunities for those growing up in the village wishing to stay here / encouraging younger families to sustain the village.
AB, AS, AY	Of a similar size to now with little development other than that currently already approved/underway. The current road infrastructure leading to/from the village will not support more development without an unacceptable increase in traffic levels particularly considering the proposed developments in Rushden and Raunds Removal of the JST eyesore Effective traffic calming A small amount of controlled development but maintaining green spaces and openness of the village. No further amenities are considered necessary
AB, AS, AY	Only small development growth with about 30 dwellings. No scope to build on the fields which give the village a feeling of detachment from nearby town/built up areas which will progressively encroach onto our village. Most proposals seek to build large houses with large plots this is unnecessary. 2 bed bungalows/3 bed houses would be better given the present housing mix in Chelveston
AB, AS, AY	Similar in size, with moderate development, with a better mix of younger people.
AB, AS, AY	Similar to its curent size but with more suitable housing for young families (affordable)
AB, AS, AY	Similar to what it is now

Post Code	Q5 - What sort of Village would you like Chelveston-cum-Caldecott to be in 20 years time?
AB, AS, AY	Small growth in houses but must have affordable housing for children of the village that want to stay to be able to afford
AB, AS, AY	The same as now
AB, AS, AY	The village has evolved since my childhood, there are nowhere near as many youngsters in the village now. The majority of residents are either commuters or OAP's. I think that Chelveston would not be appealing to young families, so therefore I don't see the need for more housing and we USED to have a village shop and post office but were not supported so both closed!
AB, AS, AY	The convenient location to towns/city's & fast roads (A14/M1/A1) 'Our' specific location within the village The fields that surround the village
AB, AS, AY	To have grown by approx 10% To support a shop/post office To have a mix of homes for older people, single people + families
AB, AS, AY	To remain just the way it is now
AB, AS, AY	Very similar to now, maybe more young people
AB, AS, AY	Very similar to the Chelveston of today, but with increased opportunities for younger families to be able to afford to live here.
AB, AS, AY	Whilst I support moderate growth/development within the village, I do not feel that large scale development is appropriate as the infrastructure cannot support it
AB, AS, AY	Younger age mix (0-18) Shop/post office Bus route playground Footpaths
AB, AS, AY	Younger age mix especially 0-18yrs Local shop for essentials Bus route playground Improved pub/restaurant Cycle lanes
AD, AE	A mix of housing & age.

Post Code	Q5 - What sort of Village would you like Chelveston-cum-Caldecott to be in 20 years time?
AD, AE	A shop. A children's play area. Public transport
AD, AE	A village away from main road traffic. Small shop for essentials. Local bus links. Not more than 20% bigger.
AD, AE	A village where the children can play and meet up thus making a better community feel. By building new houses and bringing more families to the village a stronger family community spirit. I feel that the village hall offers a arrange of things for older residents but families need to be aimed at as well
AD, AE	I hope for Chelveston to remain a small village with limited additional housing ie barn conversions and characteristic dwellings
AD, AE	I would like its character to remain but to encourage a younger element to the village and possible small business units. Any housing to be non estate and individual in keeping with the village. Increase facilities such as shop and public transport.
AD, AE	I would like the village to stay as it is, but I understand that this can never really happen. Chelveston is a calm oasis and a great escape from the now all to common urban conurbations. It's very important that Chelveston does not dissolve inbto one of these.
AD, AE	Not much bigger, more community activities ie: village green to hold fetes, sports, etc. Traffic calming. Village shop
AD, AE	Same as its is now
AD, AE	Similar to how it is now - no mass expansion, no cheap housing that attracts lower income families Would like a village green, centre to allow children to play safely Better links to Raunds & Higham i.e cycleways, pathways
AD, AE	the same as now
AD, AE	Village character to remain but to encourage a younger element to the village and possible small businesses. Housing should be non estate and be in keeping with the village. Increased facilities - shop and public transport.
AD, AE	Would be good to have a small shop maybe and local public transport. On the whole I'd like the village to stay a village. This is one of the reasons I moved here. I feel anymore houses particularly on Sawyers Crescent would cause traffic, spoil the views and create mayhem particularly a bend in Sawyers Crescent
AF, AG, AP	Approximately 10 more houses Affordable housing and more ambitious restoration projects, though all in keeping with surroundings The current facilities are realistic for the population, and sustainable Younger families are already increasing
AF, AG, AP	Hopefully not changed a great deal. Houses on JST site and a few infills but the basic layout the same as now. More young families, no more facilities as there are plenty in Raunds and Higham.

Post Code	Q5 - What sort of Village would you like Chelveston-cum-Caldecott to be in 20 years time?
AF, AG, AP	I would like it to be very much as it is now, with a few more houses so that new villagers can be absorbed into the community. Some thought needs to be given to houses that younger people can afford so that it does not become a retirement village by default.
AF, AG, AP	I would like it to stay substantially the same.
AF, AG, AP	In terms of size, I believe it should remain similar or we would loose that village 'feel'
AF, AG, AP	In twenty years time, I would like to see our village much the way it is now with more development, possibly 'ribbon' infilling along roads, but no large developments.
AF, AG, AP	Keep the villages rural aspect so that future generations can enjoy the delights that Chelveston offers
AF, AG, AP	Much the same as it is now to be honest
AF, AG, AP	Not greatly changed, with just a few extra houses, carefully located. We need to be careful to preserve the character of the village for future generations. Large scale housing would turn the village into a small 'town' without facilities, and the beauty of living in this village would be gone forever
AF, AG, AP	Not much different to now
AF, AG, AP	Not too much different to present
AF, AG, AP	Possibly a few more houses with younger families
AF, AG, AP	Similar feel and character - not grown too much It would be nice to build on the number of children/young families in the village
AF, AG, AP	Similar insize. Improved facilities, i.e. currently the only place for our age group to meet people is the pub which is not always ideal with children in tow.
AF, AG, AP	Small quiet friendly place. Just as it is now
AF, AG, AP	The same as it is now.
AF, AG, AP	The village has to expand and we need a diverse and varied mix of residents. A shop would be nice but not sure if even if village gets bigger it will get the support it needs
AF, AG, AP	the village needs to expand but not excessively
AF, AG, AP	Village has to expand but needs a diverse mix of people and property types
AF, AG, AP	Would like to keep the rural aspect of the village, so that people will be able to enjoy it in years to come
AF, AG, AP	Hopefully more young people
AF, AG, AP	I imagine a Chelveston with a shop/newsagents I would like the village to have expanded More allotments Lower average age

Post Code	Q5 - What sort of Village would you like Chelveston-cum-Caldecott to be in 20 years time?
AF, AG, AP	I would like it to maintain its village status preserving the nature, wildlife and country feel. I would like to see it attract people of varying ages whilst maintaining a good standard eg: mid/high level housing
AF, AG, AP	I would like to see more facilities and it would be nice to encourage families with young children but there would need to be more facilities to entice them here. Children's play area, shop, post office etc.
AF, AG, AP	I wouldn't mind the village growing slowly within the existing overall footprint but it must be slow so that the sense of community is not disturbed.
AF, AG, AP	I'd like to think It was slightly bigger, but if it was the same size that wouldn't be an issue. Only one pub still, no shop preferably. Similar set of houses to how it is now, try to avoid cheaper housing. Similar age mix to the current situation, maybe more of the younger generations, where did all the children go? The village doesn't need any more facilities than are currently available, get in a car and drive a couple of miles and you have everything you need!
AF, AG, AP	It's nice having all ages in an area from cradle to grave. I'd be happy for it to grow by up to 10% if necessary but equally happy if it didn't. (Personally in 20 years time I think I'd be looking to move to HF/Raunds/Thrapston as I'll be older and want plenty of shops).
AF, AG, AP	Limited building, and still to remain a village
AF, AG, AP	Maintaining quiet, rural feel and atmosphere providing for a mixed age range, Inclusion of a village shop/post office. Would not wish it to become more than 25-33% larger than today.
AF, AG, AP	More smaller houses to improve the housing mix - and a shop
AF, AG, AP	More young people Not a lot bigger
AF, AG, AP	No comment
AF, AG, AP	Not applicable to me.
AF, AG, AP	Pretty much the same as it is now. Judging by the low number of house sales it would seem that residents stay for many years and I would assume they like it just as it is.
AF, AG, AP	Roughly the same size Small development More amenities
AF, AG, AP	Similar in size with appropriate housing
AF, AG, AP	Similar size as is now
AF, AG, AP	similar to what we have today with additional house granted as part of village infill
AF, AG, AP	Still retain village feeling
AF, AG, AP	The small friendly caring village that it is now.

Post Code	Q5 - What sort of Village would you like Chelveston-cum-Caldecott to be in 20 years time?
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A village which retains its rural character 2. A housing profile that would attract both young and older families/individuals. This would require 2-4 bedroom houses as well as bungalows 3. Adequate for off-road parking facilities
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	20% larger some smaller houses proper public transport shop/parcel facilities
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	20% larger with local shop, possibly 1st school - general housing mix for all age groups.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	50% bigger, similar mix.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	A few more houses, not too many, more young people
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	A slightly larger village with more amennities and mix of residents.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	A village that has been kept small (just a few houses being built) and has a good mixture of young and elderly people
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	<p>Age mix, young and old, affordable housing is needed</p> <p>A shop to join community together</p> <p>Transportation - buses</p> <p>Less congestion in centre of Chelveston (with parked vehicles etc)</p> <p>A variety of housing to tempt any age to buy, from quality 4 beds to affordable housing</p>
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	I don't mind a few houses being built but would still like it to be a VILLAGE, possible a few family homes (within proportion) , a local shop possibly, but wouldn't want it to become a town
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	I know it has to expand but it needs to be with in a set limit so I think the least development possible in the next 20 years.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	I think that Chelveston cum Caldecott should fight to retain its village status, the majority of people like the lifestyle and have chosen to live here. The surrounding countryside is a precious asset which should be protected from property development as much as possible. If the number of houses that have been proposed are built, Chelveston would then become a small town and would be pressured into providing extra facilities ie: schools, doctors etc. I agree that there is a need for extra housing and I support some of the applications listed, however I strongly believe that the village is in danger of becoming 'one big housing estate.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	I think that Chelveston cum Caldecott should fight to retain its village status, the majority of people like the lifestyle and have chosen to live here. The surrounding countryside is a precious asset which should be protected from property development as much as possible. If the number of houses that have been proposed are built, Chelveston would then become a small town and would be pressured into providing extra facilities ie: schools, doctors etc. I agree that there is a need for extra housing and I support some of the applications listed, however I strongly believe that the village is in danger of becoming 'one big housing estate.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	I would like it to remain the same as we already have a good age mix with new development on 'Brown' sites rather than expansion and although I see room for more housing in Caldecot and Chelston Rise the road would beunsuitable for more traffic.

Post Code	Q5 - What sort of Village would you like Chelveston-cum-Caldecott to be in 20 years time?
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	I would like to see controlled development within the village boundary of all types of housing i.e. starter homes and retirement bungalows and executive properties
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Infilled village - improving old barns/truck site etc. Mostly affordable housing
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Keep it small and cosy Access to countryside should be kept - it is an important reason to live here. One of my favorite and in some ways most frequent 'uses' of the village is for peaceful walk - I do not want this changed
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Maximum 50% bigger in 20 years.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	No more than 50% bigger Principally owner/occupied Mixed ages not just retirement village Better play area within village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Not much bigger. Pub stays open. Local Shop. Wind Farm closes.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Not too overcrowded or overdeveloped - houses are needed but can be done subtly in a way that adds to the village not makes it sprawl into neighbouring villages or ruins the beauty of the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	One that has not doubled in size
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Perhaps 50% larger with a small shop.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	possible slightly larger with a shop and regular bus route . a mixed group of ages but not big enough to be classed as a town.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Pretty much the same as it is now -with some organic groth -ie.10-15% more houses would be nice to seesome younger people in the village - so some need smaller more affordable property tobuy or rent.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Prosperous with shopping facilities
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Remain as a village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Similar to how it is. Housing infill would be appropriate but would not like to see big estates tacked onto the outskirts of the village and any properties built should be in keeping with the area and correct materials used.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Similar, maybe more infill, younger people, more children, more village events
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Since I`ll be 87 in 20 years time (always supposing I make it that far!) I don`t think i`d care!
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Slightly bigger and tidier with trees (big) tidied and no flooding, more flowers about
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	slightly bigger,more young families
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Slightly larger, more young families, more facilities i.e. shop and chippy

Post Code	Q5 - What sort of Village would you like Chelveston-cum-Caldecott to be in 20 years time?
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Small community Maybe a shop No huge new building estate
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Stay like it is. Not too much expansion
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Still a village with some affordable housing for younger residents
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Still with small village feel, allow for small and infill developments. I would like a mix of all ages which is necessary to stop decline. I would like to stay as a village and not sprawl out and merge into Raunds, as seems to be happening with Stanwick.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	The same or very little change
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	To maintain its village status. Not overrun by social housing which unfortunately could result in a lot of problems associated with bored, out of work,hard up individuals.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	to remain a rural village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Tranquil!
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Very much the same as it is now.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Very much the same as it is now.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Would be good to have a shop I'd like it to really stay as it is
AQ, AW	A general store and post office
AQ, AW	A modest amount of sympathetic infill housing
AQ, AW	A reasonable amount of growth in the right areas. A good mix of age-range, which I think exists at present A village shop wouldn't go a miss
AQ, AW	As at present a good mix of age groups, perhaps with more properties for first time buyers and at the other end of the market, some bungalows.
AQ, AW	As is
AQ, AW	As it is now
AQ, AW	As it is now
AQ, AW	As it is now. Limited new development. Facilities are available in Raunds and Higham, no need for shops in village
AQ, AW	As now, if a little larger, will need more facilities - doctors (especially with expanding population of Raunds already underway). Safer walking - cycling routes if more children in village
AQ, AW	Attitudes change. Duchy Field may be seriously considered with main road access only, expanding onto Kimbolten Road on both sides
AQ, AW	Basically the same with maybe a 10% increase in size, with a similar mix of housing and residents.

Post Code	Q5 - What sort of Village would you like Chelveston-cum-Caldecott to be in 20 years time?
AQ, AW	Children's facilities - required. Sound and good gas, electricity, drainage bus service
AQ, AW	Generally the same as it is now without excess expansion, this is the reason that most of us are living here now! for what it is, and should not be spoilt ,future generations will thank us.
AQ, AW	I do not miss a bus service, shop or playground. I would like to see the village remain a similar size as it is today. People that move here do so because the size and remoteness is what they want. If we want fast food and Spar we would move to Raunds.
AQ, AW	I moved here because it is a village. Only slightly bigger, would not want it to turn into a large 'older persons' only village
AQ, AW	I would definitely like more events to take place at the local pub and in the pub garden and a bus.
AQ, AW	I would like it to stay as a 'saught after place' to live. A few dwellings to add to the village, but only to keep within a village feel/look. People come to live here for its village location and peaceful community. Adding houses on big farmland will spoil this feel for people, lowering the house prices. I don't see wy the village should expand at all, no matter how many years.
AQ, AW	I would like the village to remain small with an in fill development. No new facilities needed as shops only 5 mins away by car. housing mix should be 3/4 bed houses suitable for all ages. All should be built in keeping with he current houses
AQ, AW	I would not want the village to expand too much, maybe 10% over 20 years.We do need to encourage a mix of housing in order to ensure a healthy age mix in the village. I do feel that if all the aspirational sites are granted the nature of our village would be destroyed as the number of houses would be about doubled. To cope with this kind of increase the village would need a much wider range of facilities.
AQ, AW	I'd like the village to retain it`s community feel. I`d like it to avoid growth that would over populate the area and dilute the atmosphere.
AQ, AW	It is important for the village to progress. The village needs to maintain a mix of large houses as well as affordable homes for families. I am against doubling the village within a few years. I would like to see infill on Brown sites and conversions of farm buildings.
AQ, AW	It would be nice to make use of the surrounding area and develop a useable pathway to, for example, Higham Ferrers. It would be good to see something for the children, such as a park or field for ball games. It would be useful to have a local small shop selling essential items
AQ, AW	Keep it small

Post Code	Q5 - What sort of Village would you like Chelveston-cum-Caldecott to be in 20 years time?
AQ, AW	Maintain the current flavour and peacefulness. Housing numbers limited to an additional 25%. A full mix of age groups with more facilities for children Meeting hall and perhaps shop in Chelveston. Greater opportunities to meet newer residents
AQ, AW	Minimal change, however daily transport through the village with a shop
AQ, AW	Minimal growth - Infill and sympathetic small developments(ie 2-5 properties in one development) Mixture of ages(there are a number of younger families moving to the village now because they also want the kind of life a village such as ours has to offer)
AQ, AW	More housing for younger people but village feel and general rural atmosphere maintained
AQ, AW	Much as it is now. I would prefer quieter roads, but that's not going to happen.
AQ, AW	Much the same as it is now. Any additional housing to be small infils, sympathetic to the existing surroundings. We do not need to be concerned about homes for "village children" as the majority wish to move away to make their own lives.
AQ, AW	Much the same would suit me fine. If any development has to go ahead it should be in fil on brownfield sites providing housing in character to the village.
AQ, AW	No change
AQ, AW	Personally I do not want to see the village increase in size. The housing mix is suitable for its location. Infill is acceptable to a degree. I do not feel there is a need for extra facilities as I chose to move here knowing the current facilities are limited & prefer it this way. If the village extends along with the developments of Higham Ferrers/Raunds etc then it will become just one big town.
AQ, AW	Pretty much the same as it is now.
AQ, AW	Same as now
AQ, AW	Same as now but with public transport for those who can't drive
AQ, AW	Same but without main road or traffic calmed More tree planting
AQ, AW	Same.
AQ, AW	Similar in size with a shop
AQ, AW	Similar size mix of housing for all age groups On a bus route
AQ, AW	Similar to now
AQ, AW	Similar to now but better public transport

Post Code	Q5 - What sort of Village would you like Chelveston-cum-Caldecott to be in 20 years time?
AQ, AW	Size should only increase incrementally by way of in-fill. Mix of medium and small dwellings. The residents will be mostly elderly and retired as there are no local facilities for young families.
AQ, AW	Slightly larger with a few more facilities If Chelston Rise is developed it should have its own amenities
AQ, AW	Slightly larger, local school and small local shop. Maybe small commercial units giving local jobs.
AQ, AW	Slightly younger feel but schools & doctors & transport need to be in place before ANY development is approved.
AQ, AW	Still small in size. Smaller affordable houses.
AQ, AW	The same as now
AQ, AW	The same village and not spoilt by people just wanting to make money from building houses in our village
AQ, AW	The village needs housing for the younger generation, play grounds for children, community hall for all.
AQ, AW	Thriving community, families, more houses of the right kind in the right places, local shop
AQ, AW	To retain a village feel and minimum housing levels. not to lose the village character which we have come to love and respect. we have invested money in our house in a view to live here for the rest of our lives, lets hope we are not forced to change our plans!!!
AQ, AW	To retain the village 'feel' the size of the village should not be significantly larger than it is now. The village would benefit from more young families as the demographic seems to lean towards the older population at the moment, but retaining the current residents is important as a constantly changing population would not be conducive to forming a community spirit. The village would benefit from safer walkways and safer crossing points on the main roads/traffic calming measures. A small shop possibly housed within/ned to the Pub would also be an asset to the village.
AQ, AW	Very similar to today with minimal development.
AR, AT	Chelveston and Caldecott should expand in a controllable way which to-day may appear intrusive to some but ?? in 20 years time will be seen as sensible. The plan should serve to minimise initial developer or even local Authority interest to pursue/? to pressure for more housing which continues to rise in this area Chelston Rise: no/minimum development
AR, AT	Hopefully better
AR, AT	I personally would not want the size to change as I believe the small nature of the village is what makes it so attractive. I would like housing to remain in keeping with the traditional stone cottage 'style' Additional public transport would be a benefit for all ages
AR, AT	I want my grandchildren to recognise the nature and layout of the village Little development of sustainable housing Character house not boxes and mixed architecture, not Chelston Rise!

Post Code	Q5 - What sort of Village would you like Chelveston-cum-Caldecott to be in 20 years time?
AR, AT	I would like it to be the same size as it is now. No more housing, as it will ruin the aesthetics and the reasons people chose to live there in the first place will no longer be relevant. However, if there was a shop that was reestablished then i think it would work better now as more people need it.
AR, AT	I would like it to stay much the same with as little new development as possible.
AR, AT	I would like the village to retain its rural feel. I would like the village to have housing that is affordable for families and younger people as this is important to ensure that the village evolves and adapts to passing generations. This should ensure that the village retains its 'heart' rather than just becoming somewhere people commute to and from.
AR, AT	I would like to see a small increase in housing
AR, AT	I would not like it to grow too much. Any future developments should be sympathetic to the existing dwellings. The village should remain rural. Footpaths should be retained. Industrial developments should be kept to a minimum. I do not want the existing village to be sandwiched between large housing estates and industrial developments.
AR, AT	Ideally the same but practically accept the need for small scale properly managed development
AR, AT	Just a small increase in housing
AR, AT	Just as it is. no more houses or it will no longer be a remote quiet village. Too many town folk who know nothing about village life.
AR, AT	more development, shops, playground, etc
AR, AT	much as is now
AR, AT	Much the same as it is now.
AR, AT	Not changed much from now, maintaining rural village character. A maximum of 30% increase in housing, with some single storey dwellings and some affordable housing to enable young people to move into the village, but no flats. Keep the dwellings small with no housing estates. A sports field for football and multi-use surfaced court for netball, tennis etc.
AR, AT	Quieter than it is at present in regards to traffic flow through it. i would like to continue to enjoy the open countryside views with my grandchildren and have an ability to continue to enjoy the current unspoilt walks.
AR, AT	roughly the same perhaps 10-15% bigger, increased public transport, a small convenience store for bread milk etc.
AR, AT	Same amount of houses, same size, nothing different!
AR, AT	Similar to how it is at present
AR, AT	Small - no further development Rural - no further in-fill or development Few facilities - village hall facility to be improved Traffic restrictions through Caldecott - weight restrictions The planning meetings in Caldecott supported the above views
AR, AT	Substantially the same with very small development and green fields retained for agricultural use and not housing
AR, AT	The same size. It is a nice place to live because it is small and quiet. If it were to grow much it would lose that.

Post Code	Q5 - What sort of Village would you like Chelveston-cum-Caldecott to be in 20 years time?
AR, AT	To be about the same or similar size ideally but alternatively considered development which favours a younger dynamic coming to the village. Also consider whether a shop or other amenity necessary as the population increases.
AR, AT	To remain a quiet residential village
AR, AT	To remain relatively undeveloped. Any development to be a mix of properties to appeal to all age groups and also price range to be affordable by all groups of people ie low- high prices
AR, AT	To retain a village feel and size, with a mix of young families, older families and older residents.
AR, AT	very much as it is now .
AU	A closer knit community. a few more child friendly families so that the children already here can form friendships
AU	A few more affordable houses in the area which will hopefully bring some younger life into the village Some local amenities - shop/post office/cafe Not too large
AU	A local shop would be good but no more developments to spoil the views
AU	A local shop would be ideal but no more dwellings to spoil the country views
AU	A local shop would be nice with no more developments putting unsightly things in plain view to spoil the quiet countryside we have.
AU	A slight increase in housing, footpath to chelveston from chelston rise, bus stop/service.
AU	A slightly larger version of what it is now but not too big & any houses that are built would be affordable
AU	A village which retains the peaceful rural feel and a place to enjoy the open countryside views / footpaths.
AU	As it is today
AU	As it is, small families, not too many houses & safe areas for children & pets. It would be nice to have a small village shop nearby with the essentials but I hope the area stays small & secluded, so I would like the shop out of Chelston Rise, perhaps in Caldecott
AU	Basically as it is now. A new road surface would be nice Keep it like it is. Evolution not revolution. No huge influx of houses/industry which would dissolve and destroy the delicate nature we enjoy.
AU	Do not want it to change. Moved here because we like it. The way it was, so don't want it to change.
AU	Exactly the same
AU	Exactly the same, if it becomes any bigger I think it will lose its appeal.
AU	Extra facilities for the residents and room for the expanding families.
AU	I believe some growth is needed but no where near what people are asking for as we will no longer be a village community but a town which will ruin the area
AU	I don't really want to to change!

Post Code	Q5 - What sort of Village would you like Chelveston-cum-Caldecott to be in 20 years time?
AU	I hope to see a village which is unchanged in character. Yes some growth is necessary but hopefully this can be carefully managed. I think the current mix of residents and housing should be continued.
AU	I think a little growth wouldn't be a bad thing - but nothing too major The housing mix should stay as it is - everything fits well - townhouses etc would not be right
AU	I think that there needs to be some growth in the parish but not to the detriment of the feel of the area. I also feel that more housing for young families is needed as well as provision for the older generation.
AU	I would like it to stay the same environment, but grow slightly larger
AU	I would like the village to remain the same but a bit larger with new houses that people from here could afford. Starter homes not 4 bedroom mansions and a better road network. If there is going to be more traffic with no access for HGVs through the village i.e. a weight limit
AU	I would like the village to still be a village not a modern housing estate with no identity.
AU	I would like to see the sort of facilities usually found on a high street, maybe one or two restaurants high speed internet. I'd also like to see an influx of young residents & the availability of more 5 bedroom detached homes
AU	I would prefer to maintain the close community feel of the village & surrounding countryside to remain unchanged
AU	i wouldn't want to see it get much bigger, whilst at the same time realise we must grow. it would be nice to have a few more children about, so the kids can form some friendships, however, it is usually the older generation that move to villages, ie, retiring. a local shop would be nice, and better public transport links
AU	i'd like chelveston to continue to be the same small village that typifies the heritage of England.
AU	If the village could stay the same that would be great
AU	Improved links between villages, and improved transport links to local schools.
AU	In an ideal world the same as it is now, I feel that all ages are well represented, but change is inevitable, so limited infilling that is sympathetic to the local area would be acceptable.
AU	It can take some expansion, provided it is tasteful and attracts the right mix of people and the areas retain their "village" style environment
AU	More families with children of young school age. Better community clubs for children mixing.
AU	More housing for families, activities for children, local bus stop, shop, and better footpaths.
AU	no so very different
AU	Outskirts of the village a small shop. Safer to walk around on a public footpath.
AU	Remain as it is, not become full of houses & loads of traffic
AU	Retained as a small village as Raunds is increasing in size to compensate for more housing
AU	Same as it is today.
AU	Same as now, no more houses

Post Code	Q5 - What sort of Village would you like Chelveston-cum-Caldecott to be in 20 years time?
AU	Similar in size to maintain sense of community with a mix of ages/family types. With the possibility of school bus for families
AU	Similar sizing, shop.
AU	Similar to how it is now. Not over developed. To still have the rural setting and feeling.
AU	Similar. We chose this area for exactly that reason, incurring higher rents.
AU	small safe friendly village, catering for both young and old
AU	Staying a reasonable small village
AU	Still a village that looks like a village and not a small town
AU	The same
AU	The same as it is now
AU	The same as it is now but with a shop and a footpath from Chelston Rise to Caldecott.
AU	The same as it is now.
AU	The same as it is now. No change
AU	The same as it is now Have the roads maintained with speed bumps to slow down the traffic
AU	to remain a village.without large shops and schools. giving all ages a good countryside lifestyle. with opportunity of open walks and cycle rides.
AU	VERY MUCH THE SAME AS IT IS NOW. I AM NOT AT ALL OPPOSED TO DEVELOPMENT, BUT I WOULD NEVER HAVE BOUGHT PROPERTY IN THIS AREA HAD I KNOWN OF ALL THE PROSPECTIVE DEVELOPMENTAL STAGES.
AU	Would be please for William Pears to build on Chelston Rise
AU	Would like it to be similar to how it is now, with a good mix of people. A small shop and cafe would be a nice addition
AU	Would like it to remain the same as it is now
AU	Young families/Retirement Spacious/Green Detached housing Shop/newsagent Quiet/safe

Q6 How many additional houses would you be willing to see built over the next 10 and 20 years in each part of the Village?

Table 13		Table 14		Table 15		Table 16		Table 17		Table 18	
Caldecott		Caldecott		Chelston Rise		Chelston Rise		Chelveston		Chelveston	
Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035
NN9 6AW	50	NN9 6AP	63	NN9 6AD	As many as you like	NN9 6AP	150	NN9 6AJ	200	NN9 6AP	462
NN9 6AY	35	NN9 6AY	55	NN9 6AP	110	NN9 6AY	120	NN9 6AY	180	NN9 6AY	225
NN9 6AU	35	NN9 6AW	50	NN9 6AW	100	NN9 6AW	100	NN9 6AU	170	NN9 6AU	180
NN9 6AU	30	NN9 6AU	35	NN9 6AU	90	NN9 6AU	90	NN9 6AU	160	NN9 6AU	180
NN9 6AB	30	NN9 6AU	35	NN9 6AU	90	NN9 6AU	90	NN9 6AU	160	NN9 6AB	170
NN9 6AB	30	NN9 6AB	35	NN9 6AY	75	NN9 6AE	70	NN9 6AU	160	NN9 6AB	170
NN9 6AW	29	NN9 6AB	35	NN9 6AE	35-70	NN9 6AB	60	NN9 6AB	160	NN9 6AU	160
NN9 6AW	29	NN9 6AU	28	NN9 6AJ	50	NN9 6AE	50	NN9 6AB	160	NN9 6AU	160
NN9 6AU	25	NN9 6AU	25	NN9 6AL	50	NN9 6AL	50	NN9 6AP	154	NN9 6AJ	100
NN9 6AU	25	NN9 6AL	21	NN9 6AJ	50	NN9 6AJ	50	NN9 6AX	75	NN9 6AU	100
NN9 6AP	21	NN9 6AG	20	NN9 6AU	50	NN9 6AU	50	NN9 6AU	73	NN9 6AU	99
NN9 6AG	20	NN9 6AJ	20	NN9 6AP	50	NN9 6AW	50	NN9 6AB	70	NN9 6AU	60
NN9 6AG	20	NN9 6AS	20	NN9 6AW	50	NN9 6AU	50	NN9 6AJ	60	NN9 6AG	50
NN9 6AS	20	NN9 6AP	20	NN9 6AU	50	NN9 6AP	50	NN9 6AW	50-60	NN9 6AR	50
NN9 6AU	4-16	NN9 6AW	20	NN9 6AW	50	NN9 6AB	50	NN9 6AT	55	NN9 6AB	50
NN9 6AX	15	NN9 6AB	20	NN9 6AW	50	NN9 6AY	40	NN9 6AG	50	NN9 6AJ	50
NN9 6AJ	15	NN9 6AB	20	NN9 6AB	50	NN9 6AG	35	NN9 6AR	50	NN9 6AS	50
NN9 6AG	15	NN9 6AR	12-20	NN9 6AU	50	NN9 6AJ	35	NN9 6AG	50	NN9 6AW	50
NN9 6AU	15	NN9 6AU	4-16	NN9 6AW	50	NN9 6AB	35	NN9 6AG	50	NN9 6AP	50
NN9 6AW	15	NN9 6AJ	15	NN9 6AB	50	NN9 6AU	35	NN9 6AJ	50	NN9 6AU	50
NN9 6AW	15	NN9 6AG	15	NN9 6AB	35-50	NN9 6AU	35	NN9 6AS	50	NN9 6AU	42
NN9 6AU	15	NN9 6AB	15	NN9 6AW	45	NN9 6AU	35	NN9 6AW	50	NN9 6RA	40
NN9 6AU	15	NN9 6AP	15	NN9 6AW	45	NN9 6AU	35	NN9 6AH	50	NN9 6RA	40
NN9 6AP	14	NN9 6AU	15	NN9 6AG	40	NN9 6AU	<35	NN9 6AU	50	NN9 6AR	40
NN9 6AJ	13	NN9 6AB	15	NN9 6AW	40	NN9 6AQ	30	NN9 6AB	<50	NN9 6AR	40
NN9 6AJ	13	NN9 6AU	15	NN9 6AU	40	NN9 6AL	30	NN9 6AH	45-50	NN9 6AL	20-40
NN9 6AQ	12	NN9 6AU	15	NN9 6AX	35	NN9 6AL	30	NN9 6AT	45	NN9 6AL	35
NN9 6AP	12	NN9 6AU	15	NN9 6AE	35	NN9 6AX	30	NN9 6RA	40	NN9 6AB	35
NN9 6AR	10-12	NN9 6AU	15	NN9 6AJ	35	NN9 6AP	30	NN9 6RA	40	NN9 6AW	35

Q6 How many additional houses would you be willing to see built over the next 10 and 20 years in each part of the Village?

Table 13		Table 14		Table 15		Table 16		Table 17		Table 18	
Caldecott		Caldecott		Chelston Rise		Chelston Rise		Chelveston		Chelveston	
Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035
NN9 6AR	10-12	NN9 6AB	15	NN9 6AE	35	NN9 6AP	30	NN9 6AU	40	NN9 6AY	35
NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AY	10	NN9 6AG	35	NN9 6AW	30	NN9 6AW	40	NN9 6AE	30
NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AY	10	NN9 6AG	35	NN9 6AU	30	NN9 6AL	20-40	NN9 6AJ	30
NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AL	10	NN9 6AJ	35	NN9 6AW	30	NN9 6AU	36	NN9 6AY	30
NN9 6AT	10	NN9 6AL	10	NN9 6AB	35	NN9 6AB	30	NN9 6AW	35	NN9 6AG	30
NN9 6AT	10	NN9 6AL	10	NN9 6AJ	35	NN9 6AU	30	NN9 6AY	30	NN9 6AB	30
NN9 6AY	10	NN9 6AL	10	NN9 6AP	35	NN9 6AB	30	NN9 6AL	30	NN9 6AR	30
NN9 6AY	10	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AU	35	NN9 6AQ	25	NN9 6AB	30	NN9 6AP	30
NN9 6AL	10	NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AB	35	NN9 6AQ	25	NN9 6AB	30	NN9 6AJ	30
NN9 6AL	10	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AJ	35	NN9 6RA	25	NN9 6AJ	30	NN9 6AR	30
NN9 6AL	10	NN9 6AS	10	NN9 6AU	35	NN9 6AY	25	NN9 6AP	30	NN9 6AU	30
NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AP	10	NN9 6AU	35	NN9 6AD	25	NN9 6AJ	30	NN9 6AR	30
NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AP	10	NN9 6AW	35	NN9 6AJ	25	NN9 6AJ	30	NN9 6AR	30
NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AP	10	NN9 6AU	35	NN9 6AD	25	NN9 6AU	30	NN9 6AR	30
NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AU	35	NN9 6AL	25	NN9 6AP	30	NN9 6AR	28
NN9 6AS	10	NN9 6AN	10	NN9 6AR	35	NN9 6AD	25	NN9 6AU	30	NN9 6AU	>26
NN9 6AP	10	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AQ	10-35	NN9 6AJ	25	NN9 6AU	30	NN9 6RA	26
NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AU	<35	NN9 6AJ	25	NN9 6AW	30	NN9 6AJ	25
NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6RA	30	NN9 6AS	25	NN9 6AR	30	NN9 6AD	25
NN9 6AP	10	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AD	30	NN9 6AP	25	NN9 6AR	30	NN9 6AD	25
NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AL	30	NN9 6AP	25	NN9 6RA	26	NN9 6AX	25
NN9 6AP	10	NN9 6AF	10	NN9 6AX	30	NN9 6AW	25	NN9 6RA	26	NN9 6AX	25
NN9 6AN	10	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AP	30	NN9 6AU	25	NN9 6AP	26	NN9 6AS	25
NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AB	30	NN9 6AR	25	NN9 6AJ	25	NN9 6AH	25
NN9 6AP	10	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AJ	30	NN9 6AU	25	NN9 6AD	25	NN9 6AP	25
NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AX	30	NN9 6AR	10-25	NN9 6AD	25	NN9 6AU	25
NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AY	30	NN9 6AR	20	NN9 6AX	25	NN9 6AH	20-25
NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AQ	25	NN9 6RA	20	NN9 6AX	25	NN9 6AU	22
NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AR	10	NN9 6AQ	25	NN9 6AQ	20	NN9 6AS	25	NN9 6AU	22

Q6 How many additional houses would you be willing to see built over the next 10 and 20 years in each part of the Village?

Table 13		Table 14		Table 15		Table 16		Table 17		Table 18	
Caldecott		Caldecott		Chelston Rise		Chelston Rise		Chelveston		Chelveston	
Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035
NN9 6AF	10	NN9 6AF	5-10	NN9 6AY	25	NN9 6AQ	20	NN9 6AW	25	NN9 6AR	20
NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AB	8	NN9 6AD	25	NN9 6RA	20	NN9 6AW	25	NN9 6AQ	20
NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AB	8	NN9 6AJ	25	NN9 6AY	20	NN9 6AP	25	NN9 6AY	20
NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AN	8	NN9 6AD	25	NN9 6AL	20	NN9 6AU	25	NN9 6AL	20
NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AY	8	NN9 6AL	25	NN9 6AR	20	NN9 6AY	25	NN9 6AG	20
NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AB	7	NN9 6AL	25	NN9 6AL	20	NN9 6AR	25	NN9 6AR	20
NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AU	7	NN9 6AD	25	NN9 6AB	20	NN9 6AQ	22	NN9 6AL	20
NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AQ	6	NN9 6AP	25	NN9 6AX	20	NN9 6AU	22	NN9 6AL	20
NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AT	6	NN9 6AS	25	NN9 6AB	20	NN9 6AU	22	NN9 6AB	20
NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AJ	6	NN9 6AP	25	NN9 6AB	20	NN9 6AJ	20	NN9 6AB	20
NN9 6AU	8	NN9 6AR	6	NN9 6AP	25	NN9 6AS	20	NN9 6AJ	20	NN9 6AB	20
NN9 6AU	8	NN9 6AB	6	NN9 6AW	25	NN9 6AP	20	NN9 6AJ	20	NN9 6AU	20
NN9 6AN	8	NN9 6AJ	6	NN9 6AW	25	NN9 6AN	20	NN9 6AE	20	NN9 6AJ	20
NN9 6AB	8	NN9 6AU	6	NN9 6AU	25	NN9 6AW	20	NN9 6AE	20	NN9 6AU	20
NN9 6AR	8	NN9 6AB	6	NN9 6AB	25	NN9 6AW	20	NN9 6RA	20	NN9 6AW	20
NN9 6AB	7	NN9 6AF	6	NN9 6AU	25	NN9 6AF	20	NN9 6AY	20	NN9 6AP	20
NN9 6AB	6-10	NN9 6AW	6	NN9 6AR	20	NN9 6AB	20	NN9 6AY	20	NN9 6AU	20
NN9 6AP	6-8	NN9 6AF	6	NN9 6AT	20	NN9 6AF	20	NN9 6AR	20	NN9 6AP	20
NN9 6AH	6-8	NN9 6AL	5-6	NN9 6AY	20	NN9 6AB	20	NN9 6AL	20	NN9 6AU	20
NN9 6AJ	6	NN9 6AQ	5	NN9 6RA	20	NN9 6AY	15-20	NN9 6AB	20	NN9 6AU	20
NN9 6AE	6	NN9 6AR	5	NN9 6AL	20	NN9 6AR	18	NN9 6AB	20	NN9 6AW	20
NN9 6AG	6	NN9 6AQ	5	NN9 6AR	20	NN9 6AU	16	NN9 6AJ	20	NN9 6AW	20
NN9 6AT	6	NN9 6AQ	5	NN9 6AL	20	NN9 6AU	16	NN9 6AB	20	NN9 6AW	20
NN9 6AJ	6	NN9 6RA	5	NN9 6AL	20	NN9 6AJ	15	NN9 6AH	20	NN9 6AB	20
NN9 6AG	6	NN9 6AB	5	NN9 6AX	20	NN9 6AJ	15	NN9 6AB	20	NN9 6AW	20
NN9 6AR	6	NN9 6AT	5	NN9 6AB	20	NN9 6AB	15	NN9 6AH	20	NN9 6AB	20
NN9 6AB	6	NN9 6AQ	5	NN9 6AH	20	NN9 6AP	15	NN9 6AP	20	NN9 6AB	20
NN9 6AX	6	NN9 6AG	5	NN9 6AS	20	NN9 6AH	15	NN9 6AU	20	NN9 6AR	20
NN9 6AX	6	NN9 6AQ	5	NN9 6AH	20	NN9 6AH	15	NN9 6AP	20	NN9 6AR	20

Q6 How many additional houses would you be willing to see built over the next 10 and 20 years in each part of the Village?

Table 13		Table 14		Table 15		Table 16		Table 17		Table 18	
Caldecott		Caldecott		Chelston Rise		Chelston Rise		Chelveston		Chelveston	
Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035
NN9 6AP	6	NN9 6AQ	5	NN9 6AW	20	NN9 6AW	15	NN9 6AW	20	NN9 6AU	15-20
NN9 6AW	6	NN9 6RA	5	NN9 6AU	20	NN9 6AU	15	NN9 6AU	20	NN9 6AU	15-20
NN9 6AB	6	NN9 6AY	5	NN9 6AP	20	NN9 6AR	15	NN9 6AW	20	NN9 6AE	15
NN9 6AW	6	NN9 6AT	5	NN9 6AN	20	NN9 6AR	15	NN9 6AU	20	NN9 6AT	15
NN9 6AF	6	NN9 6AR	5	NN9 6AU	20	NN9 6AB	15	NN9 6AU	20	NN9 6AY	15
NN9 6AL	5-6	NN9 6AY	5	NN9 6AU	20	NN9 6AF	10-15	NN9 6AW	20	NN9 6AL	15
NN9 6AQ	5	NN9 6AD	5	NN9 6AW	20	NN9 6AW	12	NN9 6AU	20	NN9 6AL	15
NN9 6AQ	5	NN9 6RA	5	NN9 6AW	20	NN9 6AB	12	NN9 6AW	20	NN9 6AP	15
NN9 6AQ	5	NN9 6AD	5	NN9 6AB	20	NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AB	20	NN9 6AB	15
NN9 6RA	5	NN9 6AL	5	NN9 6AU	20	NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AR	20	NN9 6AH	15
NN9 6AQ	5	NN9 6AD	5	NN9 6AB	20	NN9 6AE	10	NN9 6AR	20	NN9 6AH	15
NN9 6AG	5	NN9 6AL	5	NN9 6AR	20	NN9 6AQ	10	NN9 6AU	15-20	NN9 6AP	15
NN9 6AQ	5	NN9 6AE	5	NN9 6AR	20	NN9 6AR	10	NN9 6AW	17	NN9 6AW	15
NN9 6AQ	5	NN9 6AX	5	NN9 6AR	20	NN9 6AY	10	NN9 6AY	16	NN9 6AJ	15
NN9 6RA	5	NN9 6AP	5	NN9 6AB	20	NN9 6AY	10	NN9 6AR	16	NN9 6AW	15
NN9 6AY	5	NN9 6AE	5	NN9 6AR	17	NN9 6AR	10	NN9 6AE	15	NN9 6AW	15
NN9 6AB	5	NN9 6AX	5	NN9 6AU	16	NN9 6AL	10	NN9 6AL	15	NN9 6AW	15
NN9 6RA	5	NN9 6AH	5	NN9 6RA	15	NN9 6AL	10	NN9 6AL	15	NN9 6AU	15
NN9 6AY	5	NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AJ	15	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AL	15	NN9 6AF	15
NN9 6AD	5	NN9 6AF	5	NN9 6AB	15	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AP	15	NN9 6AW	15
NN9 6RA	5	NN9 6AH	5	NN9 6AW	15	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AB	15	NN9 6AU	15
NN9 6AL	5	NN9 6AJ	5	NN9 6AU	15	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AP	15	NN9 6AF	15
NN9 6AD	5	NN9 6AP	5	NN9 6AF	15	NN9 6AF	10	NN9 6AW	15	NN9 6AB	15
NN9 6AL	5	NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AB	15	NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AW	15	NN9 6AF	10-15
NN9 6AD	5	NN9 6AF	5	NN9 6AF	15	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AW	15	NN9 6AT	14
NN9 6AL	5	NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AB	15	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AU	15	NN9 6AU	10-14
NN9 6AL	5	NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AU	12	NN9 6AF	10	NN9 6AW	15	NN9 6AG	12
NN9 6AE	5	NN9 6AP	5	NN9 6AU	12	NN9 6AP	10	NN9 6AU	15	NN9 6AB	12
NN9 6AB	5	NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AP	10	NN9 6AU	15	NN9 6AP	11

Q6 How many additional houses would you be willing to see built over the next 10 and 20 years in each part of the Village?

Table 13		Table 14		Table 15		Table 16		Table 17		Table 18	
Caldecott		Caldecott		Chelston Rise		Chelston Rise		Chelveston		Chelveston	
Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035
NN9 6AX	5	NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AU	10-15	NN9 6AJ	10
NN9 6AP	5	NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AU	10-15	NN9 6AE	10
NN9 6AJ	5	NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AP	10	NN9 6AW	10-15	NN9 6AQ	10
NN9 6AE	5	NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AE	10	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AJ	13	NN9 6AQ	10
NN9 6AB	5	NN9 6AR	5	NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AG	12	NN9 6RA	10
NN9 6AX	5	NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AQ	10	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AB	12	NN9 6AR	10
NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AR	10	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AF	12	NN9 6AQ	10
NN9 6AF	5	NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AQ	10	NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AF	12	NN9 6AE	10
NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AF	5	NN9 6AQ	10	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AP	11	NN9 6AQ	10
NN9 6AF	5	NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6RA	10	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AE	10	NN9 6AG	10
NN9 6AP	5	NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AY	10	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AJ	10
NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AF	5	NN9 6AG	10	NN9 6AP	10	NN9 6AE	10	NN9 6AB	10
NN9 6AP	5	NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AY	10	NN9 6AN	10	NN9 6AQ	10	NN9 6AY	10
NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AF	5	NN9 6AR	10	NN9 6AF	10	NN9 6AQ	10	NN9 6AY	10
NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AL	10	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6RA	10	NN9 6AY	10
NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AR	5	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AQ	10	NN9 6AD	10
NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AR	10	NN9 6AL	10
NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6RA	0-5	NN9 6AP	10	NN9 6AF	10	NN9 6AQ	10	NN9 6AD	10
NN9 6AP	5	NN9 6RA	0-5	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AF	10	NN9 6AG	10	NN9 6AE	10
NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AE	4	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AQ	10	NN9 6AE	10
NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AJ	4	NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AB	10
NN9 6AR	5	NN9 6AE	4	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AF	8-10	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AS	10
NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AE	4	NN9 6AF	10	NN9 6AR	5-10	NN9 6AY	10	NN9 6AW	10
NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AE	4	NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6RA	8	NN9 6AY	10	NN9 6AU	10
NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AJ	4	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AT	8	NN9 6AY	10	NN9 6AF	10
NN9 6AF	5	NN9 6RA	4	NN9 6AF	10	NN9 6AU	7	NN9 6AY	10	NN9 6AS	10
NN9 6AF	5	NN9 6AJ	4	NN9 6AP	10	NN9 6AE	6	NN9 6AL	10	NN9 6AW	10
NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AR	4	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AW	6	NN9 6AD	10	NN9 6AJ	10
NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AB	4	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AY	5	NN9 6AL	10	NN9 6AF	10

Q6 How many additional houses would you be willing to see built over the next 10 and 20 years in each part of the Village?

Table 13		Table 14		Table 15		Table 16		Table 17		Table 18	
Caldecott		Caldecott		Chelston Rise		Chelston Rise		Chelveston		Chelveston	
Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035
NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AP	4	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AB	5	NN9 6AD	10	NN9 6AP	10
NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AU	4	NN9 6AP	10	NN9 6AG	5	NN9 6AE	10	NN9 6AW	10
NN9 6AB	5	NN9 6AP	4	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AJ	5	NN9 6AE	10	NN9 6AU	10
NN9 6AF	5	NN9 6AS	4	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AQ	5	NN9 6AX	10	NN9 6AR	10
NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AU	4	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AB	5	NN9 6AR	10	NN9 6AN	10
NN9 6AY	5	NN9 6AJ	4	NN9 6AP	10	NN9 6AR	5	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AW	10
NN9 6AF	5	NN9 6AP	4	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AG	5	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AJ	10
NN9 6AF	5	NN9 6AW	4	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AY	5	NN9 6AX	10	NN9 6AU	10
NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AU	4	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AG	5	NN9 6AS	10	NN9 6AU	10
NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AW	4	NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AD	5	NN9 6AR	10	NN9 6AW	10
NN9 6RA	0-5	NN9 6AJ	4	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AE	5	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AU	10
NN9 6RA	0-5	NN9 6AW	4	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AW	10
NN9 6AF	0-5	NN9 6AW	4	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AS	5	NN9 6AF	10	NN9 6AR	10
NN9 6AJ	4	NN9 6AW	4	NN9 6AP	10	NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AX	10	NN9 6AF	10
NN9 6AE	4	NN9 6AR	4	NN9 6AN	10	NN9 6AR	5	NN9 6AS	10	NN9 6AU	10
NN9 6AQ	4	NN9 6AW	4	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AF	5	NN9 6AR	10	NN9 6AW	10
NN9 6AE	4	NN9 6AU	4	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AW	10
NN9 6AJ	4	NN9 6AF	4	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AF	10
NN9 6RA	4	NN9 6AF	4	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AF	10	NN9 6AU	10
NN9 6RA	4	NN9 6AB	4	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AP	10	NN9 6AW	10
NN9 6RA	4	NN9 6AB	4	NN9 6AF	10	NN9 6AU	4	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AW	10
NN9 6AJ	4	NN9 6AR	3-4	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AD	3	NN9 6AG	10	NN9 6AU	10
NN9 6AR	4	NN9 6AR	3-4	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AD	3	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AU	10
NN9 6AB	4	NN9 6AD	3	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AW	3	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AF	10
NN9 6AP	4	NN9 6AJ	3	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AF	3	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AF	10
NN9 6AU	4	NN9 6AD	3	NN9 6AF	10	NN9 6AW	2	NN9 6AR	10	NN9 6AU	10
NN9 6AP	4	NN9 6AQ	3	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AE	0	NN9 6AN	10	NN9 6AB	10
NN9 6AJ	4	NN9 6AR	3	NN9 6AF	10	NN9 6AX	0	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AB	10
NN9 6AP	4	NN9 6AL	3	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AX	0	NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6AU	<=10

Q6 How many additional houses would you be willing to see built over the next 10 and 20 years in each part of the Village?

Table 13		Table 14		Table 15		Table 16		Table 17		Table 18	
Caldecott		Caldecott		Chelston Rise		Chelston Rise		Chelveston		Chelveston	
Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035
NN9 6AW	4	NN9 6AD	3	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AU	Up to 10
NN9 6AU	4	NN9 6AW	3	NN9 6AF	8-10	NN9 6AX	0	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AU	<10
NN9 6AW	4	NN9 6AU	3	NN9 6AR	5-10	NN9 6AQ	0	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AY	7-10
NN9 6AU	4	NN9 6AW	3	NN9 6AF	5-10	NN9 6RA	0	NN9 6AP	10	NN9 6RA	5-10
NN9 6AJ	4	NN9 6AU	3	NN9 6RA	8	NN9 6RA	0	NN9 6AJ	10	NN9 6RA	5-10
NN9 6AU	4	NN9 6AW	3	NN9 6RA	8	NN9 6AT	0	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AW	5-10
NN9 6AW	4	NN9 6AR	3	NN9 6RA	8	NN9 6RA	0	NN9 6AP	10	NN9 6AS	9
NN9 6AW	4	NN9 6AR	2-3	NN9 6AT	8	NN9 6RA	0	NN9 6AR	10	NN9 6AQ	8
NN9 6AW	4	NN9 6AE	2	NN9 6AW	8	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AF	10	NN9 6AT	8
NN9 6AW	4	NN9 6AY	2	NN9 6AU	8	NN9 6AY	0	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AR	8
NN9 6AX	4	NN9 6AG	2	NN9 6AU	7	NN9 6RA	0	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AY	6
NN9 6AB	4	NN9 6AB	2	NN9 6AE	6	NN9 6AY	0	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6RA	6
NN9 6AB	4	NN9 6AS	2	NN9 6AB	6	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AX	10	NN9 6AD	5
NN9 6AF	4	NN9 6AW	2	NN9 6AW	6	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AQ	5
NN9 6AR	4	NN9 6AP	2	NN9 6AY	5	NN9 6AG	0	NN9 6AF	10	NN9 6AB	5
NN9 6AB	4	NN9 6AW	2	NN9 6AG	5	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AQ	5
NN9 6AB	4	NN9 6AX	2	NN9 6AJ	5	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AR	5
NN9 6AD	3	NN9 6AW	2	NN9 6AQ	5	NN9 6AG	0	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AY	5
NN9 6AJ	3	NN9 6AB	2	NN9 6AY	5	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AW	10	NN9 6AL	5
NN9 6AD	3	NN9 6AY	1	NN9 6AB	5	NN9 6AL	0	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AW	5
NN9 6AL	3	NN9 6AR	1	NN9 6AY	5	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AW	5
NN9 6AD	3	NN9 6AR	1	NN9 6AG	5	NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AR	10	NN9 6AW	5
NN9 6AU	3	NN9 6AF	1	NN9 6AD	5	NN9 6AX	0	NN9 6AF	10	NN9 6AU	5
NN9 6AW	3	NN9 6AE	0	NN9 6AE	5	NN9 6AS	0	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AP	5
NN9 6AU	3	NN9 6AX	0	NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AF	10	NN9 6AN	5
NN9 6AW	3	NN9 6AX	0	NN9 6AS	5	NN9 6AX	0	NN9 6AU	10	NN9 6AW	5
NN9 6AR	2-3	NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AS	0	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AR	5
NN9 6AE	2	NN9 6AX	0	NN9 6AP	5	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AW	5
NN9 6AE	2	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AB	10	NN9 6AF	5

Q6 How many additional houses would you be willing to see built over the next 10 and 20 years in each part of the Village?

Table 13		Table 14		Table 15		Table 16		Table 17		Table 18	
Caldecott		Caldecott		Chelston Rise		Chelston Rise		Chelveston		Chelveston	
Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035
NN9 6AR	2	NN9 6RA	0	NN9 6AP	5	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AY	7-10	NN9 6AU	5
NN9 6AY	2	NN9 6AD	0	NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6RA	5-10	NN9 6AF	5
NN9 6AB	2	NN9 6RA	0	NN9 6AR	5	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6RA	5-10	NN9 6AB	5
NN9 6AX	2	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AF	5	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	Up to 10	NN9 6AE	4
NN9 6AS	2	NN9 6AY	0	NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	<10	NN9 6AY	4
NN9 6AR	2	NN9 6RA	0	NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AF	0 - 10	NN9 6AP	4
NN9 6AW	2	NN9 6AY	0	NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AD	9	NN9 6AP	4
NN9 6AW	2	NN9 6AG	0	NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AD	9	NN9 6AP	4
NN9 6AP	2	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AB	5	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AF	9	NN9 6AW	4
NN9 6AU	2	NN9 6AG	0	NN9 6AW	4	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AW	9 (JST)	NN9 6AF	4
NN9 6AW	2	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AD	3	NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AT	8	NN9 6AR	3-4
NN9 6AU	2	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AD	3	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	8	NN9 6AD	3
NN9 6AB	2	NN9 6AP	0	NN9 6AF	3	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AR	8	NN9 6AJ	3
NN9 6AR	2	NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AW	2	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AB	<8	NN9 6AJ	3
NN9 6AY	1	NN9 6AX	0	NN9 6AE	0	NN9 6AP	0	NN9 6AW	7	NN9 6AW	3
NN9 6AR	1	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AX	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AY	6	NN9 6AW	2
NN9 6AR	1	NN9 6AS	0	NN9 6AX	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AP	6	NN9 6AW	2
NN9 6AB	1	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6RA	0	NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AD	5	NN9 6AU	1
NN9 6AB	1	NN9 6AX	0	NN9 6AQ	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	5	NN9 6AW	1
NN9 6AF	1	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AQ	5	NN9 6AE	0
NN9 6AF	1	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6RA	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AB	5	NN9 6AX	0
NN9 6AR	1	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AT	0	NN9 6AG	0	NN9 6AQ	5	NN9 6AX	0
NN9 6AE	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AL	5	NN9 6AJ	0
NN9 6AX	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6RA	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6AX	0
NN9 6AX	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AW	5	NN9 6RA	0
NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AP	0	NN9 6AY	0	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AD	0
NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6RA	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AP	5	NN9 6RA	0
NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AY	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AN	5	NN9 6AR	0
NN9 6AD	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AR	5	NN9 6RA	0

Q6 How many additional houses would you be willing to see built over the next 10 and 20 years in each part of the Village?

Table 13		Table 14		Table 15		Table 16		Table 17		Table 18	
Caldecott		Caldecott		Chelston Rise		Chelston Rise		Chelveston		Chelveston	
Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035
NN9 6RA	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AF	5	NN9 6AG	0
NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	5	NN9 6AB	0
NN9 6AY	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AF	5	NN9 6AB	0
NN9 6RA	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AB	5	NN9 6AB	0
NN9 6AY	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AL	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6RA	4	NN9 6AP	0
NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AP	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AP	4	NN9 6AJ	0
NN9 6AD	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AP	4	NN9 6AX	0
NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AX	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AP	4	NN9 6AX	0
NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AS	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AW	4	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AW	4	NN9 6AW	0
NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AG	0	NN9 6AX	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AF	4	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AH	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AS	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AR	3-4	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AS	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AD	3	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AJ	3	NN9 6AB	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AJ	3	NN9 6AW	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AU	3	NN9 6AJ	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AW	2	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	1	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	1	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AU	1	NN9 6AW	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AP	0	NN9 6AE	0	NN9 6AG	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AX	0	NN9 6AX	0	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AX	0	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AF	0	NN9 6AD	0	NN9 6AB	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6RA	0	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AJ	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6RA	0	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AG	0	NN9 6AB	0

Q6 How many additional houses would you be willing to see built over the next 10 and 20 years in each part of the Village?

Table 13		Table 14		Table 15		Table 16		Table 17		Table 18	
Caldecott		Caldecott		Chelston Rise		Chelston Rise		Chelveston		Chelveston	
Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035	Post Code	2016-2025	Post Code	2026-2035
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AF	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AD	0	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AG	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AG	0	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AW	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AX	0
NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AF	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AW	0
NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AB	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AW	0
NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AJ		NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AJ		NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AR	0
NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AJ		NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AJ		NN9 6AG	0	NN9 6AR	0
NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AJ		NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AE		NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AJ		NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AG		NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AG		NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AT		NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6RA		NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AE		NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AR	0
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AY		NN9 6AP	0	NN9 6RA		NN9 6AJ	0	NN9 6AJ	
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6RA		NN9 6AF	0	NN9 6AY		NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AJ	
NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AY		NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6RA		NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AJ	
NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6RA		NN9 6AW	0	NN9 6AY		NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AG	
NN9 6AB	0	NN9 6AD		NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6RA		NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6RA	
NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6RA		NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AD		NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AY	
NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AY		NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6AD		NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6RA	
NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6RA		NN9 6AR	0	NN9 6RA		NN9 6AU	0	NN9 6AY	

Q6 How many additional houses would you be willing to see built over the next 10 and 20 years in each part of the Village?

Table 13

Caldecott	
Post Code	2016-2025
NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AR	0
NN9 6AG	
NN9 6RA	
NN9 6AY	
NN9 6RA	
NN9 6AY	

Table 14

Caldecott	
Post Code	2026-2035
NN9 6AD	
NN9 6AY	
NN9 6AD	
NN9 6AD	
NN9 6RA	
NN9 6AY	
NN9 6AD	

Table 15

Chelston Rise	
Post Code	2016-2025
NN9 6AR	0
NN9 6AR	0
NN9 6AR	0
NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AR	0
NN9 6AG	
NN9 6AE	

Table 16

Chelston Rise	
Post Code	2026-2035
NN9 6AD	
NN9 6AY	
NN9 6AD	
NN9 6RA	
NN9 6AD	
NN9 6RA	
NN9 6AY	

Table 17

Chelveston	
Post Code	2016-2025
NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AW	0
NN9 6AR	0
NN9 6AR	0
NN9 6AR	0
NN9 6AU	0
NN9 6AR	0

Table 18

Chelveston	
Post Code	2026-2035
NN9 6RA	
NN9 6AD	
NN9 6RA	
NN9 6AD	
NN9 6AD	
NN9 6AD	
NN9 6RA	

NDP-S001 Duchy of Lancaster 5/6 dwellings Bidwell Lane

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	211 (140 with no comments)
Conditional Support	40 (0 with no comments)
Reject	89 (48 with no comments)
No Opinion	10 (8 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S001

Post Code	NDP-S001 Votes	NDP-S001 Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	Properties must be sensitive to existing cottages and the new barn conversion
AB, AS, AY	Support	Improvement on existing buildings and does not change general outlook of village.
AB, AS, AY	Support	Improvement
AB, AS, AY	Support	Good use of space not affecting anyone
AB, AS, AY	Support	BROWN SITE
AB, AS, AY	Support	Because that area is all contained into a small compact site with surrounding farm houses and buildings already, plus it's off the beaten track and I don't think it will have an effect on anyone
AB, AS, AY	Support	acceptable development
AB, AS, AY	Support	Only if the road were made wider
AB, AS, AY	Support	New houses would improve that side of the village
AB, AS, AY	Support	Looks to fit in well with existing developments
AD, AE	Support	This is unlikely to have a negative impact on Chelveston
AD, AE	Support	These conversions are in keeping with other buildings in Caldecott with good access, needed accommodation for Caldecott
AD, AE	Support	If you build affordable homes
AD, AE	Support	I think this would enhance the area, the current barns are an eyesore
AD, AE	Support	Happy to see existing old buildings developed. It's always better to see them like that rather than run down hacks.
AD, AE	Support	area would be enhanced visually
AD, AE	Support	With the removal of the old Barn new houses would just finish off this development site
AD, AE	Support	With the other building work on this site this development would tidy it all up with the removal of the old barn
AF, AG, AP	Support	Development ongoing opposite so would fit in.

NDP-S001 Duchy of Lancaster 5/6 dwellings Bidwell Lane

AF, AG, AP	Support	Buildings already exist & could be improved
AF, AG, AP	Support	Would see development on land already used for farm buildings
AF, AG, AP	Support	Would complement the Duchy Farm development opposite
AF, AG, AP	Support	This would enable reasonable development with existing characteristics maintained
AF, AG, AP	Support	This will not have a negative effect on the village
AF, AG, AP	Support	These are exactly the kind of changes I would like to see around the village, small additions here and there of a few houses, the village increases in size, but not at an alarming rate. This area is also very light in residential dwellings so an increase would bring the number of residence in this area to an acceptable figure.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Expansion is key
AF, AG, AP	Support	As the site is already developed in the form of the cattle yard, I see no problem
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Would enhance the village.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Would enhance a disused farmyard
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Should improve the site
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	I think the small scale developments are more in keeping.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Cannot identify any valid reason for opposing sensitive development
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	6 smart detached dwellings would add to the feel of the village but not overwhelm it.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	already buildings in place ,so new houses would not be a bad replacement
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Seems an appropriate use of space and won't impact any neighbours unduly
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	I don't feel this would have a high impact as there are existing building there at present
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Will tidy the road and match the opposite site
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	The farm is in need of development to tidy up some buildings in need of repair

NDP-S001 Duchy of Lancaster 5/6 dwellings Bidwell Lane

AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Atone or old brick. No detrimental outlook.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Looks like a sensible small package of houses
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	It is OK.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Houses should be built in stone or old style brick to blend into the old style of the area.
AQ, AW	Support	Keep the buildings in character with the area.
AQ, AW	Support	Would create a small hamlet of houses in a quiet area surrounded by fields. This would be a lovely place to live.
AQ, AW	Support	This would be well out of sight and sympathetic to the area.
AQ, AW	Support	This will clean up the existing area
AQ, AW	Support	This plan does not appear too imposing on others
AQ, AW	Support	The additional number of vehicles would not pose a problem as Bidwell Lane is relatively quiet and provides safe access to the B645. The proposal is for 'high quality' homes wothe buildings should therefore fit in with the surrounding landscape.
AQ, AW	Support	Sufficient space.
AQ, AW	Support	Small development within keeping of village
AQ, AW	Support	I think this will benefit from development
AQ, AW	Support	I feel that this is a reasonable proposal given that the majority of the plot is already a yard/buildings
AQ, AW	Support	Good use of redundant farm buildings.
AQ, AW	Support	Good
AQ, AW	Support	Converting farm buildings would improve area.
AR, AT	Support	Re-use of brown field site
AR, AT	Support	Husband says so
AR, AT	Support	Building on brown field site
AU	Support	Uses existing developed land.
AU	Support	Use of existing developed land
AU	Support	the existing farm buildings are unsightly and if developed to match the conversions across the road would improve that area .
AU	Support	Not a large impact on current village

NDP-S001 Duchy of Lancaster 5/6 dwellings Bidwell Lane

AU	Support	I think that 6 high quality homes will be in-keeping with the village.
AU	Support	I support this redevelopment so long as its design fits with the current structures and fits with the character of the area
AU	Support	I support this as long as it is in keeping with the current design of houses
AU	Support	I see no reason why not. In addition, I understand that the farm currently at this location is no longer viable commercially so the owners need to do something with the land.
AU	Support	High quality homes fitting existing character
AU	Support	As long as the owners of the farm are proposing or happy for this & they fit with the area
AU	Support	as long as the number of properties are not more than 6
AU	Support	Agree as no access issues & is within the farm area itself. Although the three building(marked 3)may impact as they are on the main road leading into Caldecott
AU	Support	A small high quality development will enhance the village
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Subject to seeing final proposals to ensure these are in keeping with the village.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Providing the development was not too large, in keeping with the surrounding area and the Bidwell Lane road was improved.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	IT WILL TIDY THE AREA UP.
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Fewer properties
AD, AE	Conditional Support	The Duchy of Lancaster has suggested this site really? I would support this proposition if it was for a single dwelling.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	possibly less than 6
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Less density
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	It is too large for Caldecott but might be more acceptable if it was one or two houses.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Needs to be looked at in conjunction with other developments to review traffic impact
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	more consideration to increase in traffic when taken into account with other developments on the road

NDP-S001	Duchy of Lancaster	5/6 dwellings Bidwell Lane
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Would recommend four rather than six houses because I am concerned about over development of Bidwell Lane in the light of the current development of Duchy Farm and proposal S018b
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	I would suggest 4 houses, because of concerns of Bidwell Lane becoming Bidwell Road, with the loss of its vital aspects
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	The number of houses should be decreased to 4 or less, it is probable that the high quality homes would be occupied by more than one person ie: a couple or family so that would suggest that if it was a 2 car family, as most of us are, then there would be the possibility of 12 extra vehicles. I consider this as a significant increase in traffic comparing it to how it is now. I would also be concerned for the horses at the livery which regularly use this area.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	The number of houses should be decreased to 4 or less, it is probable that the high quality homes would be occupied by more than one person ie: a couple or family so that would suggest that if it was a 2 car family, as most of us are, then there would be the possibility of 12 extra vehicles. I consider this as a significant increase in traffic comparing it to how it is now. I would also be concerned for the horses at the livery which regularly use this area.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	if affordable
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Bidwell Lane would need to be made suitable for two way traffic as it is little more than a small track with no passing
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	bidwell lane is currently a single trackroad and would hope to see some major improvement of road + access to any new homes on this site should have clear views onto high way for egress also
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	this would be a good conversion of existing buildings and land providing restrictions on any additional buildings behind the current proposed
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Reduction of properties to 4 only. Homes all with double garages and further off road parking. No further development on remaining land to be permitted.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Low density housing 2/3 sites only
AR, AT	Conditional Support	If they were built in 10-15 years time
AR, AT	Conditional Support	fewer houses
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Built in 5-20 years time

NDP-S001 **Duchy of Lancaster** **5/6 dwellings Bidwell Lane**

AR, AT	Conditional Support	Bidwell Lane needs road having major done as it cannot cope with all the traffic at the moment
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Bidwell Lane improvements to accommodate extra traffic
AR, AT	Conditional Support	a maximum of two high quality homes that add interesting architecture without unnecessary large areas of drives concrete tarmac with attention to green garden spaces and inturn minimizing the impacted of extra traffic to and from the village
AR, AT	Conditional Support	If affordable for young families or young residents who would like to stay living within the village.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	I would support if the proposals favour younger people and families by building smaller, affordable houses which offer value as well as space i.e. not cramped
AU	Conditional Support	Some improvements to the roads would be needed for this development
AU	Conditional Support	less dwellings
AU	Conditional Support	I think changes to the road for this development to go ahead are needed and wonder if this would change the entire feel of the area.
AU	Conditional Support	Detailed plans were seen and passed to be architecturally in keeping with surrounding established rural domestic dwellings
AU	Conditional Support	a better road link to it, as Bidwell lane itself is a single track farm lane
AU	Conditional Support	FIVE HOUSES MAXIMUM OVER A 20 YEAR PERIOD TO PRESERVE THE CHARACTER OF THE VILLAGE.
AU	Conditional Support	5 HOUSES MAXIMUM OVER A TWENTY YEAR PERIOD TO PRESERVE THE CHARACTER OF THE VILLAGE
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	I have some reservations about the ability of Bidwell Lane to cope with the increase in trafficand would prefer to see fewer houses
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	happy for tatty farm building to be replaced but concerned it would open floodgates for more homes ruining rural aspect of Caldecott
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Fewer dwellings (3 maximum)
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Six swellings on this site is not relective of the density being created immediately opposite in the old Duchy Farm. Three barn type conversions would be ideal for this site.

NDP-S001	Duchy of Lancaster	5/6 dwellings Bidwell Lane
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	guarantee no further development than on existing farm site
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many houses, 6 houses would mean at least 12 cars and Bidwell Lane is not suited to more traffic
AB, AS, AY	Reject	To keep this as a village
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not suitable for younger people to expensive, more affordable housing is needed
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Doesn't provide a mix of housing for the village.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Do not wish to see Caldecott grow beyond its current size
AF, AG, AP	Reject	With the other aspirational sites in a village the size of Caldecott, there is no need for another six houses on top of the others proposed
AF, AG, AP	Reject	it is nice see the open countryside when going for a walk and i dont fell the road would cope with more traffic.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Development in this area is creating a small village rather than an agricultural environment. I like the quiet counry farm lane,and dont't want to walk through a housing estate.
AQ, AW	Reject	Why should we have everything altered? It is a country village lane - probably need'improving' into a proper road which we do not want.
AQ, AW	Reject	It seems to me that most people were against any type of building being done in the village until they could make some money out of it by selling their land.
AQ, AW	Reject	It is a nice scenic area and an enjoyable walk
AQ, AW	Reject	Bidwell Lane will be to busy.
AR, AT	Reject	This is a working farmyard and should, in my opinion remain as such.
AR, AT	Reject	The effect of the 3 new houses already under construction at Duchy Farm needs to be assessed before further building is considered - maybe in the time period 2026 - 2035.
AR, AT	Reject	The development would spoil the rural feel of Bidwell Lane. The development of the farm across the road is enough.
AR, AT	Reject	It ruins the landscape, if someone wants to live in the village then they should buy a house that is already built. I do not think there should be anymore houses built.
AR, AT	Reject	I would prefer that Bidwell Lane remains rural. There is a development across the road that is already increasing the number of dwellings. Also, there is no specific mention of how many dwellings would be on the site. It is too vague.
AR, AT	Reject	I may support this if I knew what the finished houses would look like.. Are they in keeping with the style of houses already in the village
AR, AT	Reject	i can not vote on this until detailed plans are presented

NDP-S001 Duchy of Lancaster 5/6 dwellings Bidwell Lane

AR, AT	Reject	enough in the village with Duchy Farm conversions
AR, AT	Reject	Don't want more people in the Village
AR, AT	Reject	Don't really want many new houses
AR, AT	Reject	A working used farmstead. Already new developments in Bidwell Lane, not necessary to change use of farm.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I like it the way it is
AU	Reject	Want it to remain small and peaceful.
AU	Reject	They couldn't be bothered to send anyone to discuss this aspirational site, so not interested in voting
AU	Reject	No more buildings
AU	Reject	No more building
AU	Reject	Already have 3 under construction, and one outline permission granted - is this not enough?
AQ, AW	Reject	Unnecessary building in what is now a quiet back road.
AQ, AW	Reject	Unecesary
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a change - would spoil feel of Caldecott
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a change
AQ, AW	Reject	The size of this development is too big for the area. It is currently an agricultural area, not residential and not in-fill.
AQ, AW	Reject	Changes character of farming area of the village.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too large and too big an increase in the size of Caldecott
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No development in Bidwell Lane
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I can't support any proposal which involves building on green field land as future development is possible
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Danger of creeping development
AH, AJ, AL,	Reject	Too many buildings proposed, too big an increase to village size
AH, AJ, AL,	Reject	Fewer new dwellings than proposed
AQ, AW	No Opinion	I have insufficient knowledge of this area to make a valid judgement due to short residency in the village.
AU	No Opinion	I do not feel I can support or reject this proposal as I do not feel this has a big impact on us

NDP-S002 Oliver 2 Dwellings Kimbolton Road

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	170 (136 with no comments)
Conditional Support	17 (0 with no comments)
Reject	145 (92 with no comments)
No Opinion	18 (15 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S002

Post Code	NDP-S002 Votes	NDP-S002 Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	I like small developments. Also low impact on the village
AB, AS, AY	Support	It will be non intrusive
AB, AS, AY	Support	Separate access to Britten Close
AB, AS, AY	Support	Would be an enhancement to that side of the village and possibly stop people using the layby as a toilet.
AD, AE	Support	This won't affect much of the village or increase the traffic excessively
AD, AE	Support	Small scale development.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Would have own separate access
AF, AG, AP	Support	Modest development should look OK
AF, AG, AP	Support	Good infill of existing land
AF, AG, AP	Support	I hope you have the chance to build your own home. Good luck!
AF, AG, AP	Support	Maintaining sympathetic outlook to match existing surrounding properties.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Provides additional housing while not detracting from the village feel. Built within confines of existing development.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Seems sensible
AF, AG, AP	Support	Their garden is too big
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	2 dwellings ok
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	No problem.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Will not impact on traffic in Raunds Rd
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	As the barn has already been lived in, it represents only a slight change

NDP-S002	Oliver	2 Dwellings Kimbolton Road
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Looks Ok
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Seems reasonable providing adequate parking is mandated and access onto site is safe.
AQ, AW	Support	it will not impact on as many people as other choices
AQ, AW	Support	No problems.
AQ, AW	Support	I think this is a good use of the land
AQ, AW	Support	Is in keeping with the character of the village.
AQ, AW	Support	Sensible re-use of land within the existing village boundary.
AR, AT	Support	Again an infill site
AR, AT	Support	No reason for objection. Has little impact on surrounding properties.
AR, AT	Support	Would have very little impact on surrounding properties.
AU	Support	As long as its in keeping with the current house
AU	Support	As they wish to build their own home I support, so long as they listen residents & don't make it stick out or cause unnecessary disruption
AU	Support	Can only be good from the sound of the proposal
AU	Support	In built up area
AU	Support	In fill use.
AU	Support	in fill of existing own garden
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If smaller bungalows were built for elderly, or more affordable housing
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Access would need to be established from the Kimbolton Road before approval given
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If the site could be accessed from the A645, then this proposal could have legs. If for whatever reason, the access had to be from Britten Close, then I imagine all sorts of Highway issues. If this goes ahead, coupled with the other six dwellings proposed behind Britten Close properties, then that will more than double the amount of vehicle movements on Britten Close - an unusually narrow cul-de-sac.
AD, AE	Conditional Support	If no of houses is reduced to 1
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Fewer properties - maybe 1
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	I would need more information on how access from the lay by would be provided.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	If the dwelling and access is fully acceptable with their immediate neighbour and won't compromise Peggy's environment
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	As long a neighbours don't object
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	This should be for 1 dwelling. 2 is too much and the gardens will be reduced too much

<u>NDP-S002</u>	Oliver	2 Dwellings Kimbolton Road
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	The land being built on would be reduced in size
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	To only put 1 dwelling on this land, this way both houses will have an adequate garden.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	An unobtrusive low development proposal
AR, AT	Conditional Support	one house only maintain a large garden space for the new house and existing house.reduce the impact of more traffic through village.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Aslong as no trees were cut down i would agree with this proposition.
AU	Conditional Support	One house only as the environ of existing dwellings would not impaired. 2 dwellings would be cramped.
AU	Conditional Support	I would support this proposition if the houses where smaller and were built with the same materials as existing properties
AU	Conditional Support	Smaller more affordable housing
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Do not support back infill development Unsuitable access
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I do not like backfilling/garden development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I take into consideration how their neighbours feel. I do not believe in people profiteering from their land at the detriment of their fellow residents. this is unacceptable.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Leave the garden as it is, don't be greedy, buy a plot of land somewhere else, to build on. A nice big garden will be a thing of the past at this rate. Not acceptable
AB, AS, AY	Reject	NO NO NO GARDEN GRABBING
AB, AS, AY	Reject	NO NO NO IF GARDEN TO BIG MOVE
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No thank you Mr Oliver. Construction traffic will go on the Kimbolton Rd
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I question access on to the lay-by which is a valuable public amenity
AB, AS, AY	Reject	If this proposal adversely affects the layby due to access & additional vehicles will provision for parking/resting up be made elsewhere in the village? The land could support more than the 2 houses proposed ie up to 6 which would lead to more vehicles in the layby & the function of the layby greatly reduced. The Dept responsible needs to comment on the suitability of 2 or more dwellings. I doubt there was an access point when the Britten Close development was first built. There was probably a farm track as most of the land was farmland
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not access onto the layby. Will open up the site to a major development and vehicles onto the main road

NDP-S002	Oliver	2 Dwellings Kimbolton Road
AB, AS, AY	Reject	The layby provides an essential facility in the village for large vehicles/cars to rest and to overnight. A meeting point e.g car clubs and trade vehicles, village grass cutting vehicles & trailers to park up. My concern is that the proposal access point is in the heart of the layby and could have a detrimental affect on these needs which vary day to day. The proposal could seek to have more dwellings than two due to the available land at the planning stage and the risk needs to have input from the highways dept responsible for the layby
AD, AE	Reject	Again I don't feel this offers anything to the village!
AD, AE	Reject	Britten Close is already congested with traffic
AD, AE	Reject	Access from lay-by should not be allowed
AD, AE	Reject	Back garden refill
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Don't agree with everyone jumping in on the 'build a house/s in your garden' bandwagon! Where will it all end
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I cannot see why gardens need to have houses built on them, unless there is a really good reason. Having a large garden really is not sufficient reason. It is inappropriate.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Out of context with the village.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Again, building houses in gardens behind other houses just not in keeping with the village .
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Not sure on access.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Poor access through Sawyers Cres
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Busy road
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I feel this is another money making opportunity and not what I would consider part of a village plan.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	No...just no. Don't go building behind closes like this, tucking them out of site.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Access onto the Chelveston Raunds Road via the layby
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	access onto the chelveston raunds road&via the layby
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	The access point for this application is via the lay-by which is frequently and legally used by various types of vehicle. It is used by Hgv's as a last chance turning point, due to the restriction on kimbolton and they park in it overnight. as do camper vans etc. It would not be long before issues regarding vehicle access and overnight parking are raised. This is a designated lay-by and that's how it should remain.

NDP-S002	Oliver	2 Dwellings Kimbolton Road
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	The access point for this application is via the lay-by which is frequently and legally used by various types of vehicle. It is used by Hgv's as a last chance turning point, due to the restriction on kimbolton and they park in it overnight. as do camper vans etc. It would not be long before issues regarding vehicle access and overnight parking are raised. This is a designated lay-by and that's how it should remain.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	The village needs some houses with large gardens.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	feel this not for village enhancement and exit from houses should not be allowed on to the layby.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Access
AQ, AW	Reject	Bad
AQ, AW	Reject	Behind current houses . Traffic concerns
AQ, AW	Reject	I am against back garden development.
AQ, AW	Reject	I am against back garden infilling
AQ, AW	Reject	Ruin the plan of existing large houses with large gardens. Poor access, is there a right of way off the layby?
AQ, AW	Reject	Traffic/parking concerns
AQ, AW	Reject	Very poor access off layby. This can open up the other proposal potentially of Britten Close.
AR, AT	Reject	Britten Close would have been developed initially with more houses. There is no need to change it now. I cannot understand why someone would buy a house with a large garden with a view to building on it. This is unfair to existing residents.
AR, AT	Reject	I assume access through layby onto bend which I think would be dangerous
AR, AT	Reject	Over development
AR, AT	Reject	Although this may not affect me it would affect others and they may not want development. Therefore it would be inappropriate for me to make a decision that would/wouldn't affect/relate to me.
AR, AT	Reject	I cannot vote on area that doesnt affect me but my vote willaffect others more local to it.
AR, AT	Reject	The access to this is not completely clear to me. This could also make Britten Close in to a larger housing estate and I do not think our village should encourage the growth of an'upmarket' housing estate which does not appear to be inclusive
AR, AT	Reject	Access problematic
AU	Reject	Large houses mean more cars mean more traffic
AU	Reject	Large houses with lots of garages - more cars more traffic

NDP-S002	Oliver	2 Dwellings Kimbolton Road
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	The JST forlift site if agreed, would enhance the village and with nine proposed houses I feel that that is enough development for Chelveston
AU	Reject	This is garden grabbing and I believe that this would have a detrimental affect on the surrounding dwellings
AU	Reject	This is just garden grabbing and should not be allowed as the space between properties is one of the reasons why people want to live in the village but these sort of development impacts on this.
AU	Reject	Using up our countryside.
AQ, AW	No Opinion	Ambivalent to this proposal
AU	No Opinion	Do not know the location well enough to vote on this
AU	No Opinion	I like the idea of various smaller developments

[NDP-S004a](#) Chapman

Barn conversion or rebuild

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	293 (206 with no comments)
Conditional Support	8 (2 with no comments)
Reject	40 (27 with no comments)
No Opinion	9 (6 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S004a

Post Code	NDP-S004a Votes	NDP-S004a Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	Acceptable development
AB, AS, AY	Support	Acceptable development
AB, AS, AY	Support	Again good use of space
AB, AS, AY	Support	Already existing living accommodation so do not see a problem
AB, AS, AY	Support	because it is only a small area
AB, AS, AY	Support	Having lived there many years without being able to convert this is the time for it to be granted
AB, AS, AY	Support	Improvement of existing dwelling
AB, AS, AY	Support	Improvement with no change to outlook
AB, AS, AY	Support	Improvements to existing building will improve the look of Caldecott without increasing its size
AB, AS, AY	Support	The building is already there and people already live in it.
AB, AS, AY	Support	Would improve site.
AD, AE	Support	As long as the build was in keeping with the village and not obscure views
AD, AE	Support	I believe conversions of existing properties are acceptable and will not impact the village
AD, AE	Support	Needs to be updated
AD, AE	Support	Not visible from the road and no excess traffic
AD, AE	Support	Happy to see existing old buildings developed. It's always better to see them like that rather than rund down hacks.
AD, AE	Support	This is a nice way to slowly enlarge the village
AD, AE	Support	This would fit with existing property and replace an existing structure
AD, AE	Support	Will not affect anyone in Caldecott.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Buildings already exist & could be improved
AF, AG, AP	Support	Conversion or replacement of existing building
AF, AG, AP	Support	Good development of an existing building
AF, AG, AP	Support	good infill and use of existing buildings

NDP-S004a	Chapman	Barn conversion or rebuild
AF, AG, AP	Support	i feel these people have lived in a barn for long enough.
AF, AG, AP	Support	It would probably enhance the building
AF, AG, AP	Support	New things are good. If she decided it needs doing, then it probably does.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Not exactly much of a massive change, as long as it is a similar size in height as it currently is, let there be barns!
AF, AG, AP	Support	One additional property is appropriate for Caldecott.
AF, AG, AP	Support	She needs a proper home
AF, AG, AP	Support	The renovation of the existing barn would be a good and acceptable proposal. A total barn rebuild should be a last resort - to maintain village heritage.
AF, AG, AP	Support	This will not have a negative effect on the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Already in village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	As before won't impact anyone else unduly and seems reasonable
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	I see no reason to refuse and this should deliver a quality development
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	improvement to existing site
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	In keeping with area
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	need to tidy up old barn
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	No problem with this.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	only replacing current building
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	reasonable development
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Re-build/regeneration of an old building should be supported
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Subject to adequate planning supervision

NDP-S004a	Chapman	Barn conversion or rebuild
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	This is away from the road.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	will look tidy and be more useful
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Yes if building is in keeping with current property
AQ, AW	Support	A single dwelling in an existing structure is acceptable and is adjacent to houses.
AQ, AW	Support	A stone re-build would not distract from neighbouring cottages
AQ, AW	Support	Already a building on plot, new building won't effect anyone.
AQ, AW	Support	Already there so should not make any impact on the village
AQ, AW	Support	Already used as accommodation
AQ, AW	Support	As the building is already there I see no problems.
AQ, AW	Support	Good
AQ, AW	Support	Good use of an existing building and as work will be done in keeping with existing building styles
AQ, AW	Support	I have no objection to conversion of existing properties or rebuilding in a similar style
AQ, AW	Support	No impact on the village as conversion of existing barn.
AQ, AW	Support	Re-use of old building
AQ, AW	Support	Re-use of old building
AQ, AW	Support	This building already exists and is therefore not too imposing on others
AQ, AW	Support	This does not necessitate any new buildings.
AQ, AW	Support	Would have no great impact on village
AR, AT	Support	Already occupy area so would give them permanent abode
AR, AT	Support	Already used for residency with no harm to anyone. Planning should be given to secure a permanent residence.
AR, AT	Support	Barn conversion would be in taste (in-keeping) with village and buildings around the site.
AR, AT	Support	I believe formally converting would be of benefit to Caldecott.
AR, AT	Support	I fully support this proposition as outlined, the new sewage pipes connected directly to the mains are essential.
AR, AT	Support	I would support this so long as the conversion was appropriate for the area and others were not affected by the conversion/building
AR, AT	Support	Needs to be upgraded
AR, AT	Support	The building is already a home for a family and a new structure should enhance the plot

NDP-S004a	Chapman	Barn conversion or rebuild
AR, AT	Support	This barn has been used as a residential dwelling for years. Planning should be allowed for this to become a permanent residence.
AR, AT	Support	This is used as a dwelling already and would not change the dynamics of the village.
AR, AT	Support	This property building has always existed and the current owners deserve to live in a properly sound building on their own land.it would have no impact on the current village if done in a sympathetic style and the upkeep of the surrounding land maintained to the right standard it has been for the last 15 years.
AU	Support	As this is a straight replacement I don't see an issue with this application
AU	Support	Conversion of existing buildings
AU	Support	I am happy for her to make changes to the barn and land
AU	Support	I can see no problem for this barn conversion
AU	Support	I think this would be a great build as it would remain as part of the existing village
AU	Support	I'm happy for the barn to be restructured
AU	Support	if the existing farm barn is converted.
AU	Support	It's in the first phase 2016-2025
AU	Support	It's just re-developing an old building
AU	Support	No additional windows facing other properties
AU	Support	Seems like a straight replacement so would not be of concern
AU	Support	The conversion would be an existing plot behind The Barns. No objection
AU	Support	This would - it seems - to be in keeping with existing buildings. In fill not building on green fields.
AU	Support	use of existing building
AU	Support	Uses existing building.
AU	Support	Yes building already exists and is already lived in, proposal suggests keeping with local architecture
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	This scould work but the dwelling footprint should not exceed the existing footprint of the barn.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	
AD, AE	Conditional Support	I would support this proposition for a conversion only and not a rebuild.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	If it had some garden
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Would need some garden
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	

NDP-S004a	Chapman	Barn conversion or rebuild
AR, AT	Conditional Support	I think this is more acceptable than the first proposition however, there should be set guidelines to follow, it should be no higher and take up no more space than the original barn in place. People bought there houses here for the reason that the landscape is nice around it. There should be no more houses built in this area, If housing is short then they should add to preexisting towns such as Rushden because the people there don't have landscape around them anyway, so it wont make a difference. New houses should be built on derelict land that no longer has a purpose.
AU	Conditional Support	providing there is a safe entrance / exit to and from the site
AB, AS, AY	Reject	If this has been occupied for the last 15 years why does it warrant conversion/rebuilding
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No development in Bidwell Lane
AB, AS, AY	Reject	To keep as a village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Access on the road via a sharp bend.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Access on to the road via sharp bend. road used as a rat run.
AQ, AW	Reject	It seems to me that most people were against any type of building being done in the village until they could make some money out of it by selling their land.
AR, AT	Reject	Historically planning permission refused even at the High Court. Eviction notices issued but not enforced. The building falls outside the village envelope
AR, AT	Reject	This application failed at at high court some years ,the owner ignored eviction notices. Therefore this must not be granted approval for property
AR, AT	Reject	This property represents deliberate flouting of planning law. Planning permission was sought and refused 10 years ago of conversion to residential use. I am not aware that this has since been granted
AU	Reject	No more building
AU	Reject	No more buildings
AU	Reject	Opposed to any new builds/infilling
AU	Reject	Want it to remain small and peaceful.
AQ, AW	No Opinion	I have insufficient knowledge of this area to make a valid judgement due to short residency in the village.
AQ, AW	No Opinion	no great feelings either way as I feel this is a matter for the residents of Caldecott
AU	No Opinion	I do not feel I can support or reject this proposal as I do not feel this has a big impact on us

[NDP-S004b](#) Chapman

2/3 Two storey cottage

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	230 (182 with no comments)
Conditional Support	10 (0 with no comments)
Reject	95 (52 with no comments)
No Opinion	15 (13 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S004b

Post Code	NDP-S004b Votes	NDP-S004b Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	ABOUT TIME
AB, AS, AY	Support	Acceptable development
AB, AS, AY	Support	Because this area will be small
AB, AS, AY	Support	I like and prefer the 1 and 2 house developments
AB, AS, AY	Support	I'm not against this but I do take into consideration how other people may feel about it, i.e. the house opposite
AB, AS, AY	Support	It will blend!
AB, AS, AY	Support	Smaller property to potentially bring younger people to village
AD, AE	Support	It will be good infill for Caldecott.
AD, AE	Support	This is a nice way to slowly enlarge the village
AD, AE	Support	This would also fit in with the existing village
AD, AE	Support	To be built to keep in character with the village
AF, AG, AP	Support	Again this is a small development in a place that would benefit from a nice cottage, without having a large impact of the size of Caldecott or the traffic flow.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Appropriate infill
AF, AG, AP	Support	Design and materials would fit in with the other properties in the area
AF, AG, AP	Support	Good infill within current buildings
AF, AG, AP	Support	I have no objection
AF, AG, AP	Support	It will be nice for sue to have her son near to her.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Providing it's not brick
AF, AG, AP	Support	This will not have a negative effect on the village
AF, AG, AP	Support	Would fit in with current buildings
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	As before - seems a reasonable request

NDP-S004b Chapman 2/3 Two storey cottage

AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	I feel this wouldn't impact on residents
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	No problem with this.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Plenty of room within current boundries.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Small developments are ok
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	This building would have very little impact on the area and would hardly be noticed
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Would have little or no impact on views / surrounding area
AQ, AW	Support	A single dwelling adjacent to an existing house is acceptable.
AQ, AW	Support	Again would have no great impact on village
AQ, AW	Support	I do not see this as excessive and I think it would be welcomed by residents
AQ, AW	Support	Shouldn't effect area to much.
AQ, AW	Support	Small extension to village
AQ, AW	Support	Small extension to village
AQ, AW	Support	The property should be in keeping with local buildings.
AQ, AW	Support	This plan does not appear to impose on others and is only a small erection
AQ, AW	Support	Would be a sensible development on the edge of the village but not extending the boundary significantly.
AR, AT	Support	A brown field site
AR, AT	Support	Chris uses her eggs
AR, AT	Support	Infill to the village
AR, AT	Support	So long as they keep to their proposition of facing it in stone so that the front blends with the village particularly the cottage next door,
AU	Support	As long it is in keeping with the surrounding houses
AU	Support	I support this build but against the annex as this could be extended in the future and become a larger house
AU	Support	I'm happy for this - as long as it is in keeping with current buildings
AU	Support	If the cottage is of brick construction.
AU	Support	In keeping with the other properties in village
AU	Support	in line with existing village formation
AU	Support	Sits well with existing village lay-out.

NDP-S004b Chapman 2/3 Two storey cottage

AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AF, AG, AP	Support	
AF, AG, AP	Support	
AF, AG, AP	Support	
AF, AG, AP	Support	
AF, AG, AP	Support	
AF, AG, AP	Support	
AF, AG, AP	Support	

NDP-S004b Chapman 2/3 Two storey cottage

AF, AG, AP	Support	
AF, AG, AP	Support	
AF, AG, AP	Support	
AF, AG, AP	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AR, AT	Support	
AR, AT	Support	
AR, AT	Support	
AR, AT	Support	
AR, AT	Support	
AR, AT	Support	
AR, AT	Support	
AR, AT	Support	
AR, AT	Support	
AR, AT	Support	
AR, AT	Support	
AR, AT	Support	
AB, AS, AY	Support	
AB, AS, AY	Support	
AB, AS, AY	Support	
AB, AS, AY	Support	
AR, AT	Support	
AR, AT	Support	
AU	Support	
AU	Support	
AU	Support	
AU	Support	
AU	Support	
AU	Support	
AU	Support	
AU	Support	
AU	Support	
AU	Support	

NDP-S004b Chapman 2/3 Two storey cottage

AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AQ, AW	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	

NDP-S004b Chapman 2/3 Two storey cottage

AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AB, AS, AY	Support	
AB, AS, AY	Support	
AB, AS, AY	Support	
AB, AS, AY	Support	
AB, AS, AY	Support	
AB, AS, AY	Support	
AB, AS, AY	Support	
AB, AS, AY	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	
AD, AE	Conditional Support	As long as is in keeping with Caldecott Village and not obscure any other properties views to surrounding countryside
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Fewer properties
AD, AE	Conditional Support	If properties were built in keeping with existing residences

NDP-S004b	Chapman	2/3 Two storey cottage
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	If the first site is redeveloped another one in a comparatively small area is too much. I think it is either one or the other.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	The re-write their proposition paragraph and acquire a proof reader
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	No further development at rear and not linked to phase 2 necessarily (which represents too big an increase to village number of dwellings)
AR, AT	Conditional Support	I would not like this in a modern brick as it could possibly appear incongruous to the stone building next door (Rosie and Frank's cottage)
AU	Conditional Support	Providing there are safe exit/entrance links to the site
AU	Conditional Support	If access does not affect flow of traffic through village & building was in keeping with existing/surrounding buildings
AU	Conditional Support	No traffic issues in keeping with surrounding buildings
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Any residential development on this site would result in an awkward, crowded and cramped design with little private amenity space.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Do not want to see further developments in Caldecott beyond those already planned
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I feel this plot shape/size is just asset stripping to support the other proposal and with all other sites offered up it's not required.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No development in Bidwell Lane
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not enough space for a second property on this site
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Plot size too awkward for the proposed size of dwelling
AF, AG, AP	Reject	If the proposal in NDP-S004a is a viable option than building a further property in a small space would not be acceptable to me.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Trying to utilise every inch of space is not necessarily a good thing
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Access to road
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Access too road.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Does not look like a quality or sensible development as it would shoe-horn a house into too small a space and we don't need to do that in this county.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Prefer to see only Barn conversion
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	The house would be along the road side

NDP-S004b Chapman**2/3 Two storey cottage**

AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Think development of barn sufficient for site Would not want to see just rear of building facing road
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too small, no parking
AQ, AW	Reject	Access to road unsighted
AQ, AW	Reject	Not needed Too close to corner
AQ, AW	Reject	over development of rural location. Ruin character of Caldecott
AQ, AW	Reject	There is no reason to build on this small piece of land. They just seem to be doing it for money. The size of the house won't be in keeping with the rest of the village houses.
AQ, AW	Reject	They already have 4 new houses being built
AQ, AW	Reject	Too small a plot
AQ, AW	Reject	Unnecessary
AR, AT	Reject	Again, no houses should be built where there are not already buildings there. It affects the natural surroundings.
AR, AT	Reject	Development outside the village envelope. Another money making scheme
AR, AT	Reject	for years this plot outside the village envelope. allowing this proposal will only see the village grow in all directions & may lead to Chelston Rise joining up to Caldicott.
AR, AT	Reject	this property represents deliberate flouting of planning law. Planning permission was sought and refused 10 years ago for conversion to residential use. I am not aware that this has since been granted
AR, AT	Reject	I do not want the village to grow
AR, AT	Reject	I feel the area is too small and therefore not in keeping with other properties and gardens in the area.
AR, AT	Reject	not enough space to build.
AR, AT	Reject	not needed & would add nothing to the village
AR, AT	Reject	Open countryside outside the village boundaries. Not necessary if given permission for farm dwelling in barn.
AR, AT	Reject	Plot looks too small for house similar to existing property in village
AR, AT	Reject	Site too small / cramped in.
AR, AT	Reject	The plans I saw were of a brick house. I think this would be awful next door to a lovely stone cottage. I think the barn conversion would be enough
AR, AT	Reject	This would be built in open countryside and should not be permitted.
AU	Reject	4a is enough in this area without this too

NDP-S004b Chapman**2/3 Two storey cottage**

AU	Reject	Don't think this site taking into consideration the position on the road is suitable for development of any kind as it is dangerous
AU	Reject	No more buildings
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	No more infilling
AU	Reject	There seems no reason for this development apart from the making money. The shape and location of the plot does not blend itself to any buildings - as they would impose as 'being crowded in' feeling on surrounding buildings
AU	Reject	This area is a dangerous piece of road where I have nearly had several accidents due to the blind bend and adding additional housing here would in my opinion make the matter worse
AU	Reject	Want it to remain a small village.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	
AD, AE	Reject	
AD, AE	Reject	
AD, AE	Reject	
AD, AE	Reject	
AF, AG, AP	Reject	
AF, AG, AP	Reject	
AF, AG, AP	Reject	
AF, AG, AP	Reject	
AF, AG, AP	Reject	
AF, AG, AP	Reject	
AF, AG, AP	Reject	
AF, AG, AP	Reject	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	
AQ, AW	Reject	
AR, AT	Reject	
AR, AT	Reject	

NDP-S004b Chapman 2/3 Two storey cottage

AR, AT	Reject	
AR, AT	Reject	
AR, AT	Reject	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	
AU	Reject	
AU	Reject	
AU	Reject	
AU	Reject	
AU	Reject	
AU	Reject	
AU	Reject	
AU	Reject	
AQ, AW	Reject	
AQ, AW	Reject	
AQ, AW	Reject	
AQ, AW	Reject	
AQ, AW	Reject	
AQ, AW	Reject	
AQ, AW	Reject	
AQ, AW	Reject	
AQ, AW	Reject	
AQ, AW	Reject	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	

NDP-S004b Chapman 2/3 Two storey cottage

AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	
AQ, AW	No opinion	I have insufficient knowledge of this area to make a valid judgement due to short residency in the village.
AQ, AW	No opinion	No great feelings either way as I feel this is a matter for the residents of Caldecott
AU	No opinion	
AD, AE	No opinion	
AD, AE	No opinion	
AF, AG, AP	No opinion	
AF, AG, AP	No opinion	
AR, AT	No opinion	
AR, AT	No opinion	
AU	No opinion	
AU	No opinion	
AU	No opinion	
AQ, AW	No opinion	
AQ, AW	No opinion	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	No opinion	

NDP-S005 **Eldred** **3-4 Dwellings at Goldcrest, St Georges Row**

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	131 (97 with no comments)
Conditional Support	42 (1 with no comments)
Reject	159 (103 with no comments)
No Opinion	18 (18 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S005

Post Code	NDP-S005 Votes	NDP-S005 Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	I would like the idea of the smaller developments as long as the neighbours are overlooked
AB, AS, AY	Support	Only option B
AB, AS, AY	Support	Support for option A
AD, AE	Support	In keeping with village character. Infill. Would deliver advantage of creating a safer Sawyers Crescent. Option B offers best mix.
AD, AE	Support	Infill and in keeping with village character. Prefer option B as more space between dwellings. Offers opportunity to improve corner of sawyers crescent/st.Georges row.
AF, AG, AP	Support	I prefer A or B. Option C looks a bit cramped and there needs to be space for cars.
AF, AG, AP	Support	I prefer Option A. Speed bumps or rigorous speed enforcement could cut the number of 'rat run' vehicles using Water Lane.
AF, AG, AP	Support	I think it would improve the look of the village
AF, AG, AP	Support	Improvement on current development and provides opportunity for further expansion without distracting from the 'feel' of the village.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Option C
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	I support this proposal because replacing old inefficient housing with more efficient housing sized to modern needs is the right thing to do. I favour option B, but do not object to any.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	In support of option b
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	New efficient houses for inefficient old ones makes sense and looks to be a reasonable size.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Option A.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Small development ok

NDP-S005	Eldred	3-4 Dwellings at Goldcrest, St Georges Row
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Small scale infill.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Within the village and not really in view
AQ, AW	Support	A sensible re-use of land for a different housing type.
AQ, AW	Support	As the dwelling already exists, this would not be too imposing and will not intrude on green space
AQ, AW	Support	I support this infill
AQ, AW	Support	In keeping with size and location in the village, in-fill of unused land.
AQ, AW	Support	Out of the way.
AQ, AW	Support	This would be in keeping with infill and sympathetic development. Therefore would not be intrusive.
AR, AT	Support	It is hidden.
AR, AT	Support	No reason to object. Infill site within village boundaries.
AR, AT	Support	There are no reasons for objection. This site is infill and within the village boundaries.
AU	Support	Do not know the location well enough to vote on this
AU	Support	I am a believer in not standing in people's way without having a genuine reason for doing so. However, people living closer may have different views. This is my reason for supporting all other proposals henceforth
AU	Support	I would support option B as these properties seem well spaced and more in keeping with the area and there is more area to park additional cars so not causing more of a nuisance to the village
AU	Support	In fill proposal.
AU	Support	It is removing an eye sore and replacing them with new
AU	Support	nice small number of properties, spread out so not on top of existing residents
AU	Support	Only if they are in keeping with the old houses
AU	Support	Use of in fill.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	2 houses
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If the access could be sorted out I see no problem with Option B, provided there was adequate parking provided on site as St Georges Row is already a problem parking area.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If the road was made wider somehow as was discussed at the meeting
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If the widening of Sawyers Crescent happens
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	It is unlikely that Planners would find four dwellings acceptable on this site. The build form is currently linear and placing dwellings behind each other as shown in the proposed plans, would break that line and those at the far end would extend beyond the settlement boundary
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	too many buildings to replace just one - 2 should be maximum

NDP-S005	Eldred	3-4 Dwellings at Goldcrest, St Georges Row
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Did not spoil the views across the fields from Sawyers Crescent. The properties are in keeping with other houses surrounding. Allowances made for traffic if Sawyers Crescent made a one way street and widened
AD, AE	Conditional Support	It is not my view that Sawyers Cres needs widening. Traffic moves slowly through the village. That's how it should stay.
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Providing this did not impact on an already congested area - ie each house had parking which is proposed is acceptable
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	A maximum of 3 properties only.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Fewer properties.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	I would support option C as a mews development if some of the land on the corner was given over to widening Sawyer's Crescent.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	If only option B was proposed they were all smaller in keeping with surrounding (Sawyers Crescent) type properties
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	If Sawyers was widened and an additional close added running by the side of John's house to accommodate the new dwellings I feel this would be an acceptable expansion.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Issues with traffic movement on a single lane road. Road improvements to allow better parking for existing residents in St Georges Row.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Providing they are suitable and affordable for young families
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Remove "Goldcrest" altogether and do not replace it with another development. Just build the 3 properties to the rear shown in option A. All to have double garages, off road parking and retain turning area. Goldcrest site could then be used as off road parking for St George's Row and Sawyers Crescent residents.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	I support option A and maybe option B, but not C.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	I support option A or B but not C
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	If option C will improve Sawyers Crescent
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Prefer to see
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	The number of dwellings is revised to 2 or 3
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	The number of dwellings is revised to 2 or 3

NDP-S005	Eldred	3-4 Dwellings at Goldcrest, St Georges Row
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Three houses only as option B.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	2 houses maximum, development restricted to level with second house from right under option A (middle house option B), not further back behind existing properties on Water Lane
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Generally I accept to proposal to build houses in this area. The roadway is inadequate for present traffic so a significant improvement is required
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	I would support this if the new houses came to the level of the farm building adjacent & more so if it was for only 2 buildings
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	If option B or A
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Improvement of Sawyers Crescent, the road cannot take the existing traffic let alone traffic from more houses.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Only support option B - but reservations on access especially if other housing approved on Sawyers Crescent
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	subject to road widening
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	This road is very narrow and is already used as a "rat run". I feel that if the road could be widened, particularly on the bend where this development is proposed could support the proposal.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	
AR, AT	Conditional Support	I feel Option B would be less crowded
AR, AT	Conditional Support	if only 3 dwellings
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Optional A with 2-storey affordable housing as well as the proposed dormer;Or option B with similar consideration
AU	Conditional Support	2 dwellings not 4
AU	Conditional Support	I would support 2 dwellings not 4 and only if they were in keeping with the rest of the village
AU	Conditional Support	If new builds kept to similar styles as existing & no access issues
AU	Conditional Support	only 3 dwellings as this will not box in existing dwellings and keep the integrity of the village
AU	Conditional Support	Only if the new buildings were in keeping with existing surrounding dwellings & no access issues were foreseen
AU	Conditional Support	So long as they keep with the rest of the houses & don't cause any unnecessary disruption for residents
AB, AS, AY	Reject	A ridiculous proposal in my view
AB, AS, AY	Reject	BACK FILL GARDEN GRABING
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Does not make sense to demolish current home
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Existing house is not out of place. Too much traffic on an already blind spot for other drivers. Would also cause lots of disturbance to neighbours during development and look out of place within that side of the village.

NDP-S005	Eldred	3-4 Dwellings at Goldcrest, St Georges Row
AB, AS, AY	Reject	GREEDY GARDEN GRABBING.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I do not like backfill/garden development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No more dwellings
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not practical
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Only interested in making money not the village
AB, AS, AY	Reject	over development on a small site
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Site too small
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Why demolish a perfectly good house to allow access to erect further dwellings
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Would not support back infill development
AD, AE	Reject	I do not believe in garden backfill
AD, AE	Reject	I do not feel this offers the village anything extra!
AD, AE	Reject	Sawyers Crescent is already a rat-run, it does not need more traffic. Widening the road would only increase traffic flow further.
AD, AE	Reject	Strongly reject this as it will build houses overlooking other houses back gardens
AD, AE	Reject	The current house is perfectly acceptable and the change would make Sawyers Crescent worse for traffic not better
AD, AE	Reject	The proposed site is higher than surrounding properties and would impact views, light and traffic in the area may consider one dwelling to replace existing.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Access to this plot very poor.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Don't want to see from my house
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Greed. Land is too small.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I don't consider this enormously beneficial. More of a personal ambition rather than a whole village benefit to be included in the plan.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	It would be a pity to demolish a perfectly habitable property to build in the garden, which would mean more traffic upnSt Georges Row/Sawyers Crescent
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Over development of existing plot.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Over development
AF, AG, AP	Reject	these dwellings will not follow the road around. being built in john & brends garden with only one near the road is going to look completely out of place with the village.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This is a personal proposal. Not essential to village development.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This is building on backland & as well as being inappropriate it would damage the visual amenity of Goldcrest's neighbours. Building on a garden because it is too big is not appropriate as it was probably a major reason for buying the house in the first place!

NDP-S005	Eldred	3-4 Dwellings at Goldcrest, St Georges Row
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Very poor access through Sawyers Crescent - on bend
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No need for this as it is not for village enhancement only for personal gain
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Will create access problems and parking.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Will create access problems & parking
AQ, AW	Reject	Access
AQ, AW	Reject	Bad
AQ, AW	Reject	Current house and gardens are lovely, Why knock it down and build more? Road is too small to access, already a problem down there
AQ, AW	Reject	Dislike houses behind current houses Concern over traffic on Sawyers Crescent
AQ, AW	Reject	Doesn't look very pleasing, existing houses will be looking on to houses that don't need to be there. Money grabbing!!
AQ, AW	Reject	I disagree with pulling down a perfectly sound building when there is no need. Also access via Sawers Crescent dangerous
AQ, AW	Reject	I do not agree with back garden development
AQ, AW	Reject	Infringing on neighbouring properties
AQ, AW	Reject	Traffic concerns
AQ, AW	Reject	Why demolish a perfectly good, large family home?
AQ, AW	Reject	Why pull down a perfectly good home to squeeze too many properties in?
AR, AT	Reject	Although this may not affect me it would affect others and they may not want development. Therefore it would be inappropriate for me to make a decision that would/wouldn't affect/relate to me.
AR, AT	Reject	i cannot vote on area that doesnt affect me but my vote will affect others more local to it.
AR, AT	Reject	not needed. access and any of the layouts are unappealing.
AR, AT	Reject	Not practical on such a narrow existing road and exiting on a bend
AR, AT	Reject	overdevelopment
AR, AT	Reject	Road too narrow.
AR, AT	Reject	The houses are too close to existing residential properties.
AR, AT	Reject	This development would affect the aspect of current dwellings. I am also taking into consideration the development by Ray Knight which I think is much more appropriate. It is not (in my opinion)feasible to have two developments next to each other with a combined number of 14 new dwellings

NDP-S005	Eldred	3-4 Dwellings at Goldcrest, St Georges Row
AU	Reject	Already enough houses
AU	Reject	Becoming to busy, leave as a small village.
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	This is garden grabbing and I don't believe this would be in keeping with the area and cause more problems on the bend of the road

[NDP-S006](#)

Knight

8-10 Dwellings Raunds Road/Sawyers Crescent

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	126 (96 with no comments)
Conditional Support	59 (2 with no comments)
Reject	152 (102 with no comments)
No Opinion	13 (13 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S006

Post Code	NDP-S006 Votes	NDP-S006 Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	Infill
AB, AS, AY	Support	VERY GOOD MIX
AB, AS, AY	Support	With reservations it will be a genuine case of infill
AB, AS, AY	Support	With the change to the plot size this would be good'in-fill' in the village.
AD, AE	Support	Infill of village
AD, AE	Support	Natural infill
AD, AE	Support	Would support as long as it includes provision of off road parking, widening and traffic flow improvement to Sawyers crescent/st. Georges row.
AF, AG, AP	Support	I always did dislike the gap in the village
AF, AG, AP	Support	Infil of this area would be good.
AF, AG, AP	Support	This is infill area so would probably be ok but would need to be stone or built to a high spec to be in keeping
AF, AG, AP	Support	Yes, this would provide additional housing within the village and on a smaller scale.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	As proposed on brownfield land
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	It would link Pretoria cottages to the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	more houses in village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Perfectly reasonable proposal as long as a public footpath is maintained and adequate off road parking is included.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Reasonable development as long as off road parking is adequate.

NDP-S006	Knight	8-10 Dwellings Raunds Road/Sawyers Crescent
AQ, AW	Support	Good
AQ, AW	Support	I support the infill
AQ, AW	Support	If houses are similar to Raunds Road this will create a good link. Should be similar sized plots not too many
AQ, AW	Support	This seems to be a form of in-filling.
AR, AT	Support	I would want restrictions to prevent garden development.
AR, AT	Support	Infill site connecting one set of houses to another.
AR, AT	Support	Infill site within the village boundaries, joining the village.
AR, AT	Support	This does not affect any current dwelling and would not alter the dynamic of the village in any way.
AR, AT	Support	This is a natural infill. It would connect the village making the dwellings along the Raunds Road a complete and natural line. It must have suitable and safe access.
AU	Support	Developers propose to keep with existing buildings & would not spoil views of current residents
AU	Support	I support this as it would be in filling in the existing village as long as it was of similar build to existing houses
AU	Support	In keeping with existing dwellings & would bridge the divide between the main village & those on the outskirts to create a better community with no impediment/impact on views
AU	Support	smaller development
AU	Support	This seems a suitable place to increase the village capacity and it seems the proposer has given thought to the highways issues and the type of housing needed in the parish. The site in my view would be able to cope with the quantity of development proposed without looking cramped and over developed
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Access to the dwellings need to be considered as Raunds Road is a very busy road and Sawyers Crescent would have to be widened at the very least.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	I would find it acceptable to build 4 or 5 dwellings along Sawyers Crescent but do not think it would be suitable to also build along the Raunds Road. That is currently open countryside; additionally it hosts a Public Footpath, an important amenity that should be preserved as part of the village open space.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	IF 3 BEDROOM HOUSES OR 2 BEDROOM BUNGALOWS
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If fewer houses were built
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If it meant Sawyers Crescent would be wider
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	if the properties were mainly bungalows and they were not cramped 8 to 10 properties seem too many, perhaps 6 to 8 would be better

NDP-S006	Knight	8-10 Dwellings Raunds Road/Sawyers Crescent
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	More effective traffic calming through Chelveston as currently not effective at all.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Once again access and parking would need to be looked at in some detail before this should be considered. As the footpath would need to be moved this too would need to be considered.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Properties to match surrounding house types Improve footpath Follow existing build and garden lines
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Properties to match surrounding house types Improve footpath Follow existing building and garden lines
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Road access
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Traffic issues
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Fewer properties
AD, AE	Conditional Support	If road is widened & no of houses is reduced to 5
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Widening and traffic flow improvement to Sawyers Crescent/St. George's Row as well as the provision of off road parking a necessity
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	6 properties only with double garages, further off road parking and direct access to B663 for 3 properties only. As proposed this looks like overdevelopment.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	A development that is better suited for a later date than proposed
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Access issues need to be sorted and some land needs to be given over to widening Sawyer's Crescent
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Again, widen Sawyers and this could work, extending the rows of current houses is the sort of expansion the village needs as that space is not hugely important. The footpath would have to run down the side of the houses (I think this is indicated in green) so its all good! Just don't go building too much on the other side of the Raunds road, as the open field view is what makes the village a beautiful place to live.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	If it has to be done 2030/35 then I would support it

NDP-S006	Knight	8-10 Dwellings Raunds Road/Sawyers Crescent
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Natural infil to Raunds Road, houses to Sawyers Crescent would create traffic issues
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Natural infil, especially to Raunds Road, but building additional houses in Sawyers Crescent would create problems as road is very narrow
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Reduce the land and the number of properties. 8-10 is too many.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Restrictions for back garden building enforced. Improved road (St Georges Row) access and improved parking for the existing houses in St Georges Row opposite proposed site
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	The houses would need to follow the roadways on Raunds Road and Sawyers Crescent. This would be in line with houses on Raunds Road.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	There should be a reduced number of dwellings in the mid size range only 6-8(max). Access from the Raunds Road only and better improved footpath access
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	4 dwellings only
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Fewer dwellings
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Half of these
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	if affordable
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	If the plan was for fewer dwellings
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	No road access onto Raunds Road utility road at rear of houses exiting onto Sawyers Crescent.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Only allow 6-8 properties
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Ten looks too squashed in that area, would only support 8
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	The number of dwellings is reduced to 5. 3 on raunds road and 2 on sawyers crescent
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	The number of dwellings is reduced to 5. 3 on raunds road and 2 on sawyers crescent

NDP-S006	Knight	8-10 Dwellings Raunds Road/Sawyers Crescent
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	4-6 dwellings and their widening of Sawyers Crescent. A carpark for the existing houses in Sawyers Crescent.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	A sensible location to infill within the village but more details of potential access required.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Fewer dwellings (6?)
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Good access is needed before any builds can go ahead.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	I feel that 10 houses would be too many, would be happier with 5 - 7.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	If the number of dwellings was reduced to 5 therefore taking up less land.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Public foot path
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Re the concern raised over traffic implications of this proposal. Subject to road safety and access being suitable to council planning
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Reduce number and build on Raunds Road only.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Sawyers Crescent needs substantial widening/improving.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Sawyers Crescent too narrow for more traffic
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Sawyers Crescent would have to become one way & more residents parking provided
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Support if houses only along Raunds Road and not down Sawyers Crescent
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Widening of Sawyers Crescent and access off Raunds Road. Building after 2025
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Would support if houses built only along Raunds Road and not down Sawyers Crescent
AR, AT	Conditional Support	8 dwellings of affordable housing in keeping with rest of the houses/homes along Raunds Road, joining the village together.

NDP-S006	Knight	8-10 Dwellings Raunds Road/Sawyers Crescent
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Again would prefer to see mainly affordable housing favouring younger tenants
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Houses in Raunds Road only, none in Sawyers
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Smaller number of properties or access from the Raunds Road as I feel Sawyers Crescent unsuitable for more parking/driveways
AU	Conditional Support	I think that this would be a suitable place to develop but a mix of houses would be appropriate including some smaller houses and bungalows but ensuring as always that there is adequate parking for owners and their visitors
AU	Conditional Support	if the numbers were reduced
AR, AT	Conditional Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Can't support green field dev Sawyers Crescent is a 'rat run' with constant parked vehicles & risk of having an RTA
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I believe this leads to more of the field being developed
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I can't support any of these green field developments. They nearly always lead to more houses
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Loss of green space Spoils the character of the village Too much development making the village too large
AB, AS, AY	Reject	More traffic on the Raunds Road. Access to Raunds. Just because we have open fields doesn't mean we have to build on them
AB, AS, AY	Reject	My personal reasons are that we bought our house because of the open countryside around us - we do not want neighbours! Also concerns still over how much of the field will be taken up - there seems to be a "grey area" on around a quarter of the plot which no one has said what is going to be done with that.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No more dwellings thank you
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not on green fields. Major access problems
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development

NDP-S006	Knight	8-10 Dwellings Raunds Road/Sawyers Crescent
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This is building in open countryside. Raunds Road already has too much traffic. If this part of the field is built on then they will build on the rest and we will lose more countryside and have another housing estate.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many
AD, AE	Reject	Excess traffic on an already busy Raunds Road and Sawyers Crescent. The view when coming through the centre of the village towards Raunds will be ruined.
AD, AE	Reject	The road is already quite busy with the flow of traffic on Sawyers Crescent so this would make it unbearable if access is from that road.
AD, AE	Reject	The view from my house is directly opposite this site it would spoil, also major concern as to traffic for construction on Sawyers Crescent
AD, AE	Reject	This would destroy the open aspect of the village and again traffic for Sawyers Crescent would increase, 8 - 10 houses in the area is not feasible and would increase traffic access on the road
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I feel this a key site within the village, and needs careful thought. It could provide play are or other facilities.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	It would completely change the view of the village as you enter it from Raunds. It is too big a development for the village & is not appropriate on greenfield land.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Sawyers Crescent is too tight. Major road infrastructure is needed
AF, AG, AP	Reject	The feeling of open space between developments in the village is an important part of its character. The proposal would 'close' an open space and I lack confidence that back development permission would not be sought at a later date.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	The roads and infrastructure are poor in this area and increased housing to this extent will impact all in the village
AF, AG, AP	Reject	We dont need more traffic on sawyers crescent as the road is very narrow now cars are parked on one side
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Already enough houses in Chelveston.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	This would only add to the traffic on a totally unsuitable road that has become a 'rat run'
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	To big and will have poor access.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Will create access problems
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Will create access problems and parking

NDP-S006	Knight	8-10 Dwellings Raunds Road/Sawyers Crescent
AQ, AW	Reject	Access to site
AQ, AW	Reject	I am opposed to developing what is currently open land with no existing building. The village does not need to increase so much as to warrant this.
AQ, AW	Reject	I feel this would be stretching the boundaries of the village.
AQ, AW	Reject	I think he has made enough out of selling land and houses in Chelveston already
AQ, AW	Reject	Losing this open space would damage the rural feel of the village. Having open spaces either side of the road into the village enhances the character of Chelveston.
AQ, AW	Reject	There are no existing houses in this area so cannot be classed as in-fill.
AQ, AW	Reject	To many houses.
AQ, AW	Reject	totally ruin views and character of village. Over development. Concerns over access onto B645 and Sawyers Crescent too narrow
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural land
AR, AT	Reject	It would block existing open views for current residents
AR, AT	Reject	Although this may not affect me it would affect others and they may not want development. Therefore it would be inappropriate for me to make a decision that would/wouldn't affect/relate to me.
AR, AT	Reject	I cannot vote on area that doesn't affect me but my vote will affect others more local to it.
AR, AT	Reject	This is usable farm land there is no need to get rid of it.
AU	Reject	Going into the open countryside
AU	Reject	It will spoil views & cause unnecessary traffic
AU	Reject	It would take away too much farm land
AU	Reject	Nice small village as it
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	No more houses - otherwise it will become a town.
AU	Reject	this is too dangerous for access onto the road
AU	Reject	to many houses, filling up what appears to be the last bit of land with no houses on it
AU	Reject	Use of open field
AU	Reject	Uses a field with no prior building use.

[NDP-S007](#) Knight 1 Dwelling Water Lane

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	217 (177 with no comments)
Conditional Support	12 (1 with no comments)
Reject	105 (65 with no comments)
No Opinion	16 (16 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S007

Post Code	NDP-S007 Votes	NDP-S007 Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	Acceptable development
AB, AS, AY	Support	I don't feel that 1 house will have too much of an affect on anyone
AB, AS, AY	Support	If Mr Knight would like to build his own house.
AB, AS, AY	Support	IT WILL SIT IN NICE.
AB, AS, AY	Support	Ownership will be retained by a known villager
AB, AS, AY	Support	Sustainable development
AB, AS, AY	Support	This is a small development which will sit well in the Village
AD, AE	Support	Again just infill
AD, AE	Support	It would have no impact on any views in the village & would sit nicely in the countryside
AD, AE	Support	no excess traffic. Would prefer stone built
AD, AE	Support	This is a sensible proposition
AF, AG, AP	Support	1 House in that much land makes it seem like a similar type to the current house next to it, this is another small extension which I feel the village needs.
AF, AG, AP	Support	As long as it is one dwelling.
AF, AG, AP	Support	As long as this is built sympathetically, with consideration for neighbours, I think this is appropriate & the proposer is a villager who intends to live in the property.
AF, AG, AP	Support	But only one here!
AF, AG, AP	Support	Can't see any objection to this on the edge of the village
AF, AG, AP	Support	Could be viewed as in-fill
AF, AG, AP	Support	Needs sensitive design to complement Hall Farm House
AF, AG, AP	Support	Seems a reasonable option given the location
AF, AG, AP	Support	This development would not significantly detract from the character of the village or surrounding area.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Yes but with consideration given to neighbouring properties

NDP-S007	Knight	1 Dwelling Water Lane
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	A house in keeping with those in the road.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	I support this proposal as long as views are not impaired keeping the rural aspect of Water Lane.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	No problem.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	One house development should be ok, only minor concern is that then spreads out in future?
AQ, AW	Support	For owners own use
AQ, AW	Support	I see no problem.
AQ, AW	Support	I support the infill
AQ, AW	Support	No objections - 1 residence for own use
AQ, AW	Support	No problem with this
AQ, AW	Support	Not out of keeping with neighbouring houses.
AQ, AW	Support	Provided planning given is for 1 dwelling only
AQ, AW	Support	See no real impact on neighbours and a sensible plot to develop.
AQ, AW	Support	This plan for build would not be too imposing on others
AR, AT	Support	It is hidden
AR, AT	Support	One extra house along Water Lane. Fits in with plot sizes and does not make any obstructions.
AU	Support	Don't see this development being an issue
AU	Support	I believe that this proposition would not have a negative effect on the area or increase traffic so do not have any issues with this
AU	Support	I support this build but would like to see it built of red brick and slate roof
AU	Support	Only if it is in keeping with the current house
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Any dwelling on this site should have to follow the existing build form and not be placed too far back into the site.
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Again the property should be in keeping with Hall Farm House and traffic kept to a minimum
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	If this was the only property to be built and not open the flood gates for more properties on this site.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	restrictions on size of buildings additional to proposed dwelling ie: large barns/garages etc
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	If neighbour agrees and doesn't impact them too much

NDP-S007	Knight	1 Dwelling Water Lane
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Only if the existing neighbour was fully satisfied that their environment was not being compromised and the plot was a similar suitable size and nature
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	I am confident that this development would not have an adverse affect on the area.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	If the plans for locating the house is approved by the neighbouring property I would have no objections.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	The construction tradfic would not damage or obstruct the surrounding roads.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	With careful use of building materials and design to fit into and not dominate its location.
AU	Conditional Support	As long as they listen to residents & do not affect their views. Do not build a huge property that will stick out & affect residents
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Extends the village boundaries too far
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No more dwellings
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I can't support any of these green field developments. They nearly always lead to more houses
AB, AS, AY	Reject	There is a problem with access to this site
AD, AE	Reject	? Offers nothing to village but one dwelling!
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Loss of landscape and views
AF, AG, AP	Reject	The view as you come through the ford into the village on water lane has always been a pleasant one with hallfarm house being the fist on the left .it would be a shame to change this after over 100 years
AF, AG, AP	Reject	The views across the piece of land early morning and late evening are breath taking and should not be lost. This would also impact any wildlife living in these areas.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Totally out of character with Hall Farm. Would spoil view from Water Lane. Owner has other more appropriate land to build his new home on.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Access to road
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	access to road
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I think there are better options for expansion elsewhere in the village.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	There are other proposals that are far better.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	This is another slight expansion of the village and would in time lead to further planning consent along the either side of the brook in Water Lane

NDP-S007	Knights	1 Dwelling Water Lane
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too big an increase
AQ, AW	Reject	Access onto already difficult bend
AQ, AW	Reject	Bad
AQ, AW	Reject	Creates potential for development of adjacent field on Water Lane adjoining Wateryard Barnes
AQ, AW	Reject	Flooding
AQ, AW	Reject	On bad bend - unsighted
AQ, AW	Reject	Open field & opens up the possibility for further development between here & Wateryard Spinney as 'infill'
AQ, AW	Reject	I think he has made enough out of selling land and houses in Chelveston already
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural ground in open countryside.
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural land
AR, AT	Reject	Not an infill site. Agricultural land in open countryside.
AR, AT	Reject	Not appealing and would spoil existing views
AR, AT	Reject	Although this may not affect me it would affect others and they may not want development. Therefore it would be inappropriate for me to make a decision that would/wouldn't affect/relate to me.
AR, AT	Reject	I cannot vote on area that doesnt affect me but my vote will affect others more local to it.
AR, AT	Reject	The access looks potentially difficult. Also, a large area for one dwelling. Just not needed and again might not be an affordable dwelling
AR, AT	Reject	The village should end at its current boundary and I cannot see what this development would achieve to enhance the village.
AU	Reject	Agree with neighbouring dwellings that loss of view should not be an issue
AU	Reject	As with local residents, this could mar the landscape & spoil existing views which residents have enjoyed
AU	Reject	Due to potential flooding
AU	Reject	Going into open countryside, when will it stop
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	No need to build on greenfield site .
AU	Reject	There is enough houses here, nice small village.
AU	Reject	Use of open field
AU	Reject	Uses a field.

NDP-S008 Keith Carr 12-16 Dwellings Raunds Road

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	74 (63 with no comments)
Conditional Support	29 (0 with no comments)
Reject	232 (133 with no comments)
No Opinion	15 (15 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S008

Post Code	NDP-S008 Votes	NDP-S008 Comments
AD, AE	Support	This infill, facing properties that have been recently given planning
AF, AG, AP	Support	I support this as it is not going ahead for another 16 + years and the traffic the houses cause will be on the raunds road and hopefully they wouldnt come down sawyers crescent and water lane.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	6 to 8.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Reasonable development as long as parking is adequate to preserve access along this busy road.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	This is fine as long as adequate off road parking is required to ensure that a busy through road continues to have clear passage.
AQ, AW	Support	Good
AQ, AW	Support	This development would have the affect to slow incoming traffic from Raunds. At present properties on one side even with the speed restriction does not seem to slow down the traffic.
AR, AT	Support	it would be in keeping with the village and the houses opposite
AR, AT	Support	This would be the 'next step' in Chelveston housing.
AU	Support	Good to see that highways issues are considered during this process and I believe that this would again be a good site to gain housing that would benefit the parish
AU	Support	I support this build as it will have starter homes for young people in the area. So long as there was no more building behind these.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	I think if this area was developed it may potentially slow traffic coming into the village although I think 12 -16 houses are too many
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If fewer houses were built

NDP-S008	Keith Carr	12-16 Dwellings Raunds Road
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	This number of houses are not needed at present, but possible consideration for 2026 onwards perhaps
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Traffic calming
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	An earlier proposal which incorporated a new road still appeals to me.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Maximum of 12 only
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	No bungalows!
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Numbers reduced
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Reduce the number of houses to maybe 4-5 and add them onto the end of the Britain Close/Raund Road houses (bottom left corner of the red box with 12-16 in)so the field view from the current Raunds Road houses is not obscured significantly.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Reduced numbers
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	The number of dwellings should be reduced to 10-12 max. The road access is permitted. The Raunds Road/The Green/B645 layout and safe pedestrian crossings should be introduced.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	The properties would need to be set back and a footway be provided and overall there would need to be fewer properties. An access drive to the proposed properties in Britten Close would also be needed along the side of the ditch. But no through road to Kimbolton Road.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Again I agree with comments in the proposal regarding road safety. Might agree if this was properly addressed
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Lower number of properties - possibly 8 - 12
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Only one entrance to the side?
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Will this extend the village too much? One road into complex is good
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Maybe another 12 dwellings will be needed in twenty years from now

NDP-S008	Keith Carr	12-16 Dwellings Raunds Road
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	If the number of dwellings was reduced to 6-8 therefore reducing the amount of land being built on
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Less properties- 8 - 10 would be acceptable
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	May be 8-10 houses as plots should be of decent size as others around there. Think this should be developed on as suggested. Not too soon.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Maybe more housing will be needed in 2035
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Slightly too many houses, maybe 10 nice size houses with good size gardens and drives.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	This proposal significantly "closes in" Raunds road - not a welcome feature. A significant reduction in the number of dwellings and the exact type is needed to make a more informed judgement.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	A smaller development of 6 - 8 houses.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Affordable housing but option of road development to by-pass village centre?
AR, AT	Conditional Support	With consideration of access and no further buildings within the plots once built.
AU	Conditional Support	A suitable mix of houses would need to be placed on this site and as the timescale is in the future a consultation nearer the time would be needed. Careful consideration must be taken to ensure that all open areas of the village are not built on so losing the country feel
AU	Conditional Support	I believe the number of properties is too many. Perhaps half as many would be better. The road is fast and busy at this point what will be done to make it safe?
AU	Conditional Support	smaller development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Again extra traffic, spoiling the open field views. Access onto the Raunds Road. Don't want to be looking at more houses.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Another green field development which has a 'high' risk of further housing if approved by the village when plans are submitted. Fronts very busy Raunds Road with H&S issues for traffic
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Chelveston to link Raunds Must not lose village boundary
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I believe this would lead to more of the field being developed
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I feel this is not 'in-fill' coupled with the other proposals is not required

NDP-S008	Keith Carr	12-16 Dwellings Raunds Road
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Loss of green space Changes the character of the village Potential future development behind this in the future Too many houses
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No more dwelling
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No way would most likely result in much larger housing scheme linking up with Kimbolton Rd
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not on green fields. Major access problems. Will open up a development between Raunds Road and Kimbolton Road
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Quite simply, I do NOT want a row of houses to look out on, we did not pay a premium to live in a village with open views for nothing.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Spoil village also destroying agricultural land when we need to grow more crops,
AB, AS, AY	Reject	The traffic using Raunds Road is getting heavier all the time & with the building going on in Raunds it is going to increase even more, without more houses on Raunds Road
AB, AS, AY	Reject	There is no need to extend the village any further outwards, there is enough land within the existing village settlement boundaries to accommodate an appropriate amount of dwellings for the next twenty years.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This is a step too far! and will only satisfy greed!!!
AB, AS, AY	Reject	TO BIG TO EARLY.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	TO EARLY FOR THAT SIDE OF ROAD
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Traffic implications, visual approach to village impaired.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Unnecessary extension of village and changes feel of village by losing large attractive green area.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	We enjoy looking at the wind turbines not a sprawling OAP's village
AB, AS, AY	Reject	We would lose the open approach to the village. There would be increase in traffic. Fantastic views and open countryside would be lost. When these houses are built then the rest of the field would be developed and yet another housing estate for Chelveston. We do not need big houses.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Would ruin the approach from Raunds
AD, AE	Reject	excess traffic and speeding on Raunds Road. Views across countryside spoilt
AD, AE	Reject	This would just open up a large scale development and again ruin the visual aspect of the village

NDP-S008	Keith Carr	12-16 Dwellings Raunds Road
AD, AE	Reject	Too many houses for the village and the road. This would change the character of the village. Any houses here would need to compliment those on the opposite side of the road.
AD, AE	Reject	Too many houses which would negatively affect the character of the village and for the road in its current form.
AD, AE	Reject	Too many properties in a small area. If all of these proposals go ahead the village will change completely leading to the need for more local amenities and further change
AD, AE	Reject	Would like to keep open field as people enter the village
AF, AG, AP	Reject	As other Raunds road development
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I like the open aspect along Raunds Road. To build houses would give a much larger fell to our village.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	No further development to the east of the B663 should be permitted. Such development could only have a significantly detrimental impact on traffic through the village.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Overdevelopment of village
AF, AG, AP	Reject	The 10% figure that Chelveston has to meet is covered with the JST site and Ray Knights site next to Hall Farm, plus a few others such as NDP-S005/NDP-S002
AF, AG, AP	Reject	this could open up additional development in the back fields
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This proposal is for a significant block of housing thaty I feel would detract from the character of he village.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	To many properties.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too many
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too much development to village
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Would change the whole look of the village as you enter from Raunds & is far too big for the village & inappropriate on a greenfield site.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Would this be where it ends or just the start of a bigger plan.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Access
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Access to road either through the layby or the chelvestonto raunds road
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	If planning is approved I feel it would open the flood gates for Keith Carr apply for additional planning in the future on the land to the rear of this plot, thus saturating the village with houses I also feel that it would have a detrimental effect on the residents that currently live opposite. ie: overlooked
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	If planning is approved I feel it would open the flood gates for Keith Carr apply for additional planning in the future on the land to the rear of this plot, thus saturating the village with houses I also feel that it would have a detrimental effect on the residents that currently live opposite. ie: overlooked

NDP-S008	Keith Carr	12-16 Dwellings Raunds Road
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No, far too much impact on opposite houses and on their environment
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Opens up potential to develop out to Kimbolton Rd
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Outside village boundary Extends village into arable land
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Proposed development in the arable land and will have an impact on the local area. It seems to be outside the village boundary
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Ruin the view for Raunds rd residents
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Spoils outlook for other houses
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	The houses currently down Raunds rd have views across the fields which would be ruined by this development
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	This is a further expansion of the village and should be kept as it is. This would only lead to a further development application at a later date
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	This would lead 1. to loss of rural aspect for existing homes on Raunds Road opposite proposed development 2. increased traffic taken in conjunction with development behind Darsdale Home and S006 leading to further traffic issues at the Green
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too big and could lead to further development.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too big an increase
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many houses for Chelveston. Could be traffic problems.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too much development of open countryside
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Tunnel effect as you enter the village from Raunds
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Will ruin the environment for those opposite - purely a financial motive not thinking of those people or the village
AQ, AW	Reject	Concerns over traffic.

NDP-S008	Keith Carr	12-16 Dwellings Raunds Road
AQ, AW	Reject	Extends village boundary into open countryside
AQ, AW	Reject	Extends village into countryside
AQ, AW	Reject	I think this would spoil the entrance to the village
AQ, AW	Reject	Loss of views not infill
AQ, AW	Reject	No houses are currently have access to this side of Raunds Road and it would be dangerous to get access for this proposed estate.
AQ, AW	Reject	Open field should remain such.
AQ, AW	Reject	Overdevelopment - ruin character of village. Concerns about traffic onto B645
AQ, AW	Reject	Losing this open space would damage the rural feel of the village. Having open spaces either side of the road into the village enhances the character of Chelveston
AQ, AW	Reject	Spoil the entrance to the village
AQ, AW	Reject	This would stretch the boundaries of the village.
AQ, AW	Reject	To many houses.
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a change - would alter village too much
AQ, AW	Reject	Too many houses for the site location
AQ, AW	Reject	Too many houses proposed and I feel that this sort of linear ribbon development would inevitably risk Chelveston becoming part of the proposed developmentsfor Raunds and we would lose our village identity.
AQ, AW	Reject	Would alter village too much
AQ, AW	Reject	Would completely change the character of the Raunds road, and a start to further development towards Raunds.
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural ground in open countryside.
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural land
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural land in open countryside.
AR, AT	Reject	Do not need this if Raymond Knight (NDP-S006) is approved and that is my preference
AR, AT	Reject	Outside the village envelope
AR, AT	Reject	Although this may not affect me it would affect others and they may not want development. Therefore it would be inappropriate for me to make a decision that would/wouldn't affect/relate to me.
AR, AT	Reject	There is open countryside that would be lost and people moved there for that view. Not a view of houses.
AR, AT	Reject	This originates a new area of development. It is not an infill as with NDP-S006. It would spoil existing views and the current rural aspect.
AR, AT	Reject	unappealing and would spoil existing views
AU	Reject	Clearly encroaching into important countryside again, too many houses for the area in one hit.Again this would increase the traffic around the village, we have enough of Carr Brothers lorries on these country lanes
AU	Reject	concerned over access

NDP-S008 Keith Carr 12-16 Dwellings Raunds Road

AU	Reject	Farm land
AU	Reject	Large development on a bad road. This would affect traffic & possibly be a danger to pedestrians & drivers
AU	Reject	Large development on main. Danger to local & other road users
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	Taking the views from the current houses of the beautiful views
AU	Reject	The field is peaceful & a lovely view - you would cause huge traffic & encourage a busier neighborhood - we like it quiet
AU	Reject	Too many dwellings in one go. Will spoil views, etc
AU	Reject	Too much infill and houses already
AU	Reject	Use of open field
AU	Reject	Uses a field.
AU	Reject	Would like to keep a nice small village.

[NDP-S013](#) JST

9 2/3 Bedroomed dwellings, Higham Road

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	251 (154 with no comments)
Conditional Support	40 (2 with no comments)
Reject	47 (33 with no comments)
No Opinion	12 (12 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S013

Post Code	NDP-S013 Votes	NDP-S013 Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	But not for so many dwellings
AB, AS, AY	Support	Definite improvement to village centre. Much needed affordable housing.
AB, AS, AY	Support	I think this will improve the look of the village
AB, AS, AY	Support	I think this would be an ideal location for affordable houses
AB, AS, AY	Support	Ideal development for the village if they are affordable
AB, AS, AY	Support	IT WILL LOOK BETTER THAN WHAT IS THERE NOW
AB, AS, AY	Support	IT WILL TIDY THIS AREA UP NICELY
AB, AS, AY	Support	It would tidy up the site
AB, AS, AY	Support	More effective speed calming needed through Chelveston
AB, AS, AY	Support	Removes an eyesore Sustainable development for Chelveston Would be a complimentary development and improve the look of the village
AB, AS, AY	Support	This is a MUST for the Village. JST must go and this will make the village a prettier one
AB, AS, AY	Support	This is the most suitable option as far as I am concerned. Replace an eyesore with some houses. I do however have reservations regarding the entrance and fast speeding traffic on that Higham Road (I do already)
AB, AS, AY	Support	This must be the best area in the village to be developed it would benefit most people by increasing everyones property values the only drawback seems to be plots 8 & 9 as they appear too close to the road and they may be trying to squeeze too many properties onto the plot
AB, AS, AY	Support	This would rid the village of an eyesore
AB, AS, AY	Support	Would greatly improve the village to not have lorries reversing on such a bad bend and would certainly look better
AB, AS, AY	Support	9 dwellings at the Fork Trucks yes they will look in with the rest of the cottages in Chelveston
AB, AS, AY	Support	As early as possible
AB, AS, AY	Support	Would be vast improvement on current site usage

NDP-S013 JST 9 2/3 Bedroomed dwellings, Higham Road

AB, AS, AY	Support	Enhance village
AB, AS, AY	Support	Makes sense to get rid of industrial in village
AB, AS, AY	Support	Provided the dwellings are in keeping with the other stone clad houses nearby
AB, AS, AY	Support	This would be better than JST make village nicer
AB, AS, AY	Support	This would be good for the village but care must be taken to ensure the land is not contaminated
AB, AS, AY	Support	Will improve the look of the village as you enter it.
AD, AE	Support	JST is ugly and not in keeping with the character of the village. It will be good to see the lorries gone.
AD, AE	Support	This is the worst part of the village Housing would be a maximum bonus
AF, AG, AP	Support	Careful development, in keeping with the centre of the village, would enhance this area a good deal
AF, AG, AP	Support	Really nice development this will fit in well with our village.
AF, AG, AP	Support	This would be an asset to the village & would be a marked improvement to that area of the village.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Best plan on offer
AF, AG, AP	Support	jst is an eye sore and a danger when there big lorries are taking up the path when parked. if we have some development in the village sooner rather than later then this would be a good site
AF, AG, AP	Support	Design details are important here and an increase in off road (non-tandem) parking needs to be designed in.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Good use of a very ugly building. The current business does not suit the village
AF, AG, AP	Support	I think this is a superb idea and a good use of the land. Please ensure there is enough parking - there should be more than is recommended by planning.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Provides opportunity for expansion on land already in development use
AF, AG, AP	Support	Sensibke change of use/purpose
AF, AG, AP	Support	This is an excellent idea, increase the number of residence in the village whilst reducing large expansions, just keep the houses of a similar type to those of duchy close.
AF, AG, AP	Support	this should fit well into existing surroundings
AF, AG, AP	Support	Will improve the look of the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	JST is an eyesore.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	They will improve the look of the village centre, currently it's a bit of a mess!

NDP-S013 JST 9 2/3 Bedroomed dwellings, Higham Road

AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Will enhance centre of village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	will improve the overall look of the village centre
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	will improve the entrance to the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Will improve village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Will remove an eyesore from the village.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Would tidy the site.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Will improve the look of the area
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	would look better than current commercial unit
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	I support this application because it would move this industry out of the village and it would enhance the area around the memorial. It would also provide affordable housing for the young and elderly alike
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	This development will be the best thing for the village it will give a better impression without the current bad impression of the site
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	will make the village look like one!

NDP-S013 JST 9 2/3 Bedroomed dwellings, Higham Road

AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	a change of use would make this site much more attractive.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Anything residential would be better than a motor business in the village centre
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	As this site is central to the village careful consideration is required to select the correct materials so the properties blend into the surrounding houses.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Excellent. Hideous at present
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Hideous currently so will improve village
AQ, AW	Support	A change of the present use of this area is welcome
AQ, AW	Support	A good addition to the village, proposed housing mix is sensible, and tidys up the centre of the village.
AQ, AW	Support	A good mix of properties that if finished in the correct materials would be a vast improvement on the present buildings
AQ, AW	Support	An improvement to the centre of the village.
AQ, AW	Support	Brownfield site, would improve the village expecially if it was stone fronted facing the road (B645).
AQ, AW	Support	Completely makes sense JST is not in keeping with the village
AQ, AW	Support	Enhance the appearance on entering Chelveston
AQ, AW	Support	Fewer dwellings would be preferred however current JST site is an eyesore so any sympathetic and reasonable development would be an improvement
AQ, AW	Support	Good
AQ, AW	Support	Good use of industrial site
AQ, AW	Support	Good use of industrial site
AQ, AW	Support	Greatly enhance the appearance of the village.
AQ, AW	Support	Houses will tidy what is now rather an eyesore. No more artics blocking the B645 whilst unloading near the bend.
AQ, AW	Support	I have no objection if JST decide to relocate out of the village, the residential housing would be the best use of the site.
AQ, AW	Support	I would want to see opportunities for traffic calming on higham road explored with this development.

NDP-S013 JST 9 2/3 Bedroomed dwellings, Higham Road

AQ, AW	Support	Must be developed when JST leave - 9 dwellings seem acceptable
AQ, AW	Support	This development would enhance the village.
AQ, AW	Support	This is a sensible proposal and would improve the village by getting rid of a rather run down site without adding too many properties.
AQ, AW	Support	This is an eyesore to the village and I would welcome it being improved.
AQ, AW	Support	This will improve the centre of the village
AQ, AW	Support	Will improve appearance of village
AR, AT	Support	A good scheme which would fit sympathetically within the village. An improvement on existing commercial use.
AR, AT	Support	Affordable housing on an established site in the centre of the village. New dwellings would enhance this industrial site and improve the village
AR, AT	Support	I agree due to the fact that the buildings already there are ugly and untidy
AR, AT	Support	Needs to be built in a style to fit the character of the village with adequate parking spaces. Parking can be a problem in that area.
AR, AT	Support	re-use of brown field site
AR, AT	Support	This land is already unsightly, houses would improve this area.
AR, AT	Support	This would enhance the current space. It is a natural infill. There must be a safe access to the dwellings.
AR, AT	Support	Very sympathetic building scheme to replace a commercial site which as it stands is an eyesore in the village.
AR, AT	Support	Will improve and eyesore in the village
AR, AT	Support	would provide appropriate housing and improve appearance of village
AR, AT	Support	Would seem a reasonable use of industrial land and improve the village
AU	Support	Acceptable change of use.
AU	Support	appear nicely spread out
AU	Support	Area has previously been built on, and would add value and bring up the appearance of the site
AU	Support	Built up area
AU	Support	change of use from industrial to housing
AU	Support	I support this build as it is in fill and would smarten up the centre of the village but have concerns over the entrance to properties. May be should have entrance via foot lane not the B645
AU	Support	Only if it is in keeping with the houses surrounding
AU	Support	So long as it fits in & does not not stand out too much. Perhaps less than 9 to still leave the area not too built up & rural
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	9 reduced to 8 or dwelling next to Hawthorns moved 'away' from boundary. Front facing dwellings to be stone faced

NDP-S013 JST 9 2/3 Bedroomed dwellings, Higham Road

AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	I'm very supportive that the JST site is developed, and as soon as possible. However; design is a subjective matter and I feel the design shown is very poor indeed. Uninspiring and simple....I believe so much more could be made of a space of this size and I would hope more effort is put into creating a high quality design for the centre of our village.
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Fewer properties
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Providing access is from Higham Road only
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Would improve the village but need to be aware of traffic flow and access on a very busy corner - this needs further consideration.
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Would improve the village but traffic flow and access need further consideration due to heavy use of the B645 and the manner in which the road bends.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Carefully consideration to access would be required due to the main road
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	I would much prefer to see houses than JST. However, at least 2 parking spaces per house should be the minimum provided. As this development is so close to an already congested part of the village and could cause problems.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	This again looks like overdevelopment. I would support 6 properties only with greater parking and garaging facilities and strictly observed "No Parking" on the B645 for residents or visitors.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	1. Proximity of plot 1 to adjacent residential property 2. Position of turning area is a potential safety hazard because heavy vehicles will have to reverse either up or down new road bisecting the site 3. Building material should be stone rather than brick in keeping with adjacent cottages
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Proximity of Plot 1 to adjacent housing. Internal road design inadequate and cramped Building materials should match adjacent cottages ie stone
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Looks like they haven't considered adequate parking facilities for 9 houses. Chelveston already has parking issues, would prefer 8 houses with other plot for extra parking
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	The proposed number of dwellings is reduced The dwellings are low level, preferably bungalows. Additional access possibly off Foot Lane
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	The proposed number of dwellings is reduced The dwellings are low level, preferably bungalows. Additional access possibly off Foot Lane

NDP-S013 JST 9 2/3 Bedroomed dwellings, Higham Road

AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	As long as houses are in keeping with existing properties
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	As long as the houses were suitably matched to those around it and access wasn't compromised
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Experience of living on a housing estate of this density shows that there is not enough parking space and that there would be inevitable overflow onto turning areas and then onto the main road making accidents frequent and unavoidable. OK to have some houses here but fewer and more parking space mandated. Houses 6, 7 8 and 9 would park on the main road for sure.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Fewer houses. Parking wholly inadequate and cars would block the main road leading to more accidents than at present.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Concerns about access.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Less houses
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Less houses will be dangerous turning in & seeing to seeing to exit site
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Additional vehicles generated by these new houses would be travelling through the village on a daily basis so safe crossing points need to be established. The style of housing befits the adjacent memorial.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Fewer, larger dwellings
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Less houses more parking!
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Support development of fewer larger homes
AR, AT	Conditional Support	If there were fewer dwellings as they as they are ridiculously smaall(compare with moment). 3-4 properties maximum
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Less houses
AR, AT	Conditional Support	would need to see detailded plans & may be in favour if it tidys the site up.

NDP-S013 JST 9 2/3 Bedroomed dwellings, Higham Road

AR, AT	Conditional Support	Far too dense - better to build no more than 5 dwellings and to be in keeping with houses next door at "The Green"
AR, AT	Conditional Support	The house numbers were reduced. 9 dwellings is a large amount for the site may 5 would be more in keeping. Also houses should be in line and look similar to those already next door.
AU	Conditional Support	REDUCED NO. OF HOUSES
AU	Conditional Support	I believe that this is a great opportunity to develop this site but more needs to be done for road safety and maybe changes to the junction near by should be included in the proposal. I also don't believe enough visitor parking has been included in the plans
AU	Conditional Support	if restricted to six dwellings
AU	Conditional Support	if the village got a bypass
AU	Conditional Support	REDUCED NO. OF DWELLINGS
AU	Conditional Support	The buildings are in keeping with existing buildings
AU	Conditional Support	The correct/safe access off the busy road is put in place
AU	Conditional Support	This is an ideal srae to develop but I have reservations about parking and the road system getting to the additional housing as I don't believe enough space is available for visitors to these houses so believe people will park on higham road. The junction just outside the development is already a dangerous junction and believe improvement works will need to be incorporated into the planning application for this site
AB, AS, AY	Reject	3 would be plenty
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AD, AE	Reject	The village needs to stay a village
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Access would be off an already busy road at a particularly dangerous spot
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Potential adverse effects
AQ, AW	Reject	It would make the B645 safe Would improve the look of the site

NDP-S013 JST 9 2/3 Bedroomed dwellings, Higham Road

AQ, AW	Reject	This plan is too imposing on surrounding houses, they would be overlooked by the new build and this would be too intrusive. Too much land being taking up.
AU	Reject	Another large development on bad part of main road
AU	Reject	Large development which may be a danger as it is on a bad road within the village. Also a loss of community spirit may ensue if too many houses built in the village
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	Traffic on bend of road.
AU	Reject	Would be the only plan I support as this site currently is an eyesore
AU	Reject	Would like to keep it a nice non busy village.

NDP-S014 Allen 6-8 Mews Dwellings around a courtyard

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	104 (71 with no comments)
Conditional Support	18 (1 with no comments)
Reject	217 (124 with no comments)
No Opinion	11 (8 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S014

Post Code	NDP-S014 Votes	NDP-S014 Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	I don;t feel that would really have any impact on the houses the other side, so would therefore support this.
AB, AS, AY	Support	Not affecting Chelston Rise too much
AB, AS, AY	Support	Such development is needed.
AB, AS, AY	Support	Need affordable housing prefer 6
AD, AE	Support	Affordable housing is a necessity for any area
AD, AE	Support	Only for housing
AD, AE	Support	Only if used for houses as described
AD, AE	Support	I accept this because it is a brown fill site adjoining new houses
AF, AG, AP	Support	Affordable houses needed
AF, AG, AP	Support	This type of development needed in village
AF, AG, AP	Support	Expansion is key
AF, AG, AP	Support	If we agree to expansion of Chelston Rise it is difficult to turn this down.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Provided the the mews development is done as specified - ie distinct from Chelston Rise
AF, AG, AP	Support	This development and NDP-SO19a makes a natural addition to Chelston Rise
AF, AG, AP	Support	this development would allow the village population and origin to be maintained, with the small/managed introduction of affordable housing
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Affordable dwellings are necessary for younger people
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	More affordable houses needed
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Not detrimental to anyone else's properties
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	This wouldn't be in the way of existing homes and wouldn't ruin views etc

NDP-S014	Allen	6-8 Mews Dwellings around a courtyard
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	There would be a need for the youngsters/or older villagers to down size
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	We do need some of this type of dwellings
AQ, AW	Support	A good sized rural style development with affordable homes.
AQ, AW	Support	A reasonably sized development for the area.
AQ, AW	Support	An extension of current buildings.
AQ, AW	Support	Good
AQ, AW	Support	If Chelston Rise is to be developed then this land should be also
AQ, AW	Support	Making it easier for first time buyers to step on to the property ladder and being able to afford ones own house
AQ, AW	Support	The size of this application would be in keeping with my preferred growth of the area.
AQ, AW	Support	This would provide housing for young families who could take advantage of the Children's play facilities that already exist in Chelston Rise.
AR, AT	Support	Apparently
AU	Support	Better than a traveller site
AU	Support	The description sounds as if these dwellings will not change the look of the surrounding area too much
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	details of type of affordable dwellings
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If incorporated into Chelston Rise development
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	IF IT WAS WITH CHELSTON RISE
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	In conjunction with William Pears Group 35 dwelling proposal.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Support 2 or 3 dwellings only
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Less Desity
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Lesser Density
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	The plan should be changed to provide fewer properties. The plot isn't large enough.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	But 4 not 6
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Fewer houses in this sort of plot. Squeezing 6-8 houses here would be far worse than say two quality houses in such a prominent position.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Two houses of good size for this prominent position.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Provided WPG secure planning I don't see any objection. Without this I think the plot is too remote for the build. It sits too far from existing properties
AR, AT	Conditional Support	4 houses maximum with improved access to the road.

<u>NDP-S014</u>	Allen	6-8 Mews Dwellings around a courtyard
AR, AT	Conditional Support	If developed in conjunction with Chelston Rise for exit and entrances then no need for extra access on dangerous corner
AR, AT	Conditional Support	If included in Chelston Rise development using their entrances thus saving an entrance on a dangerous bend
AU	Conditional Support	I think this site is not big enough for the number of dwellings proposed and would be better suited being incorporated into chelston rise
AU	Conditional Support	If this was part of the chelston rise estate and of a similar design then would be more happy with the proposal
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Housing density too high Increased traffic levels through Caldecott Loss of green space It will spoil the character of Chelston Rise
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I do not like this site as it is building in open countryside
AB, AS, AY	Reject	no development on greenfield site
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not a suitable location for 6-8 properties, situated near a sharp bend
AB, AS, AY	Reject	On its own, this is an attempt to build in the open countryside, which, in accordance with the NPPF, should be resited. However; if WPG ever get permissions to develop the Chelston Rise complex, then a carefully thought out plan, that fits in with the WPG plan, could work. This applicant has recently been advised that planning permissions will not be considered as the site falls into the open countryside category
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Poor access to a large development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This small site is too remote
AD, AE	Reject	overall plot does not tie in with the village.
AD, AE	Reject	Overall plot seems to be out on a limb as I have voted against the William Pears proposals.
AD, AE	Reject	The proposition suggests 6-8 affordable dwellings, but in fact these will only be 2 or 3 affordable dwellings.
AD, AE	Reject	Too many properties which would eventually lead to the land between the proposed properties and existing being filled (35 + 70)
AD, AE	Reject	Too many properties. This would lead to a future conurbation.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	`Affordable` suggests social housing which may put stress on already over-subscribed local facilities.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	appearance is too many buildings for the size of the land
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Because it will bring Chelveston Rise too close to Caldecott

NDP-S014	Allen	6-8 Mews Dwellings around a courtyard
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Because it will open up the William Pears Group aspirational sites
AF, AG, AP	Reject	The site would become too crowded
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This is inappropriate for undeveloped land & is a small housing estate.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This would alter the housing type of the village and would encourage future expansions in that area which would eventually lead to two sets of contrasting house types and ultimately populations living next to each other.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This would not'tie in' with current development, it is too far away.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too many new buildings
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Totally inappropriate place for residential development.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	as a stand alone development this would over ride 6-8 houses isolated from surrounding s+ rest of village i also object if it is tacked on to so19a+so19b assuch a large development inappropriate for size of the village .not sure how it meets local needs etc.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Cannot see necessity for this proposition if William Pears proposal for 35 houses goes ahead. Could lead to a "Them and us" situation!
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Chelston Rise is a unique housing estate and does not need to become a town on its own
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I reject this application, affordable dwellings....static caravans comes to mind. A way of the land owner getting around his previous rejection of planning application on this parcel if land...
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I reject this application, affordable dwellings....static caravans comes to mind. A way of the land owner getting around his previous rejection of planning application on this parcel if land...
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Not within existing boundary
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Road access
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Road access
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	This would only add to the expansion of the village and is for personal gain and does not enhance the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too far our of Caldecott
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too much development of Chelston Rise taken in conjunction with NDP-S019a and too isolated in the absence of S019a
AQ, AW	Reject	Access & overcrowding of site - needs to be included in Chelston Rise not on its own

NDP-S014	Allen	6-8 Mews Dwellings around a courtyard
AQ, AW	Reject	Affordable suggests for young families, yet the village does not have the facilities to attract families regardless of the housing types available. Families have moved away from the village due to lack of facilities!
AQ, AW	Reject	Bad site for houses on a bend in the road.
AQ, AW	Reject	Development opens up possibility of further building between this site and existing Chelston Rise properties which I oppose
AQ, AW	Reject	Has no connection to the village
AQ, AW	Reject	Inappropriate position for this type of development
AQ, AW	Reject	Isolated. No fit with village
AQ, AW	Reject	No fit with village
AQ, AW	Reject	Not suitable location for low cost dwellings owing to high cost of transport
AQ, AW	Reject	One cannot build 'affordable dwellings' when gallons of petrol are needed to travel to work, school, doctors etc.
AQ, AW	Reject	To small a developement in an isolated position, would chnage the character of approach to Chelston Rise.
AQ, AW	Reject	Too remote a site for development (sociall affordable or otherwise
AQ, AW	Reject	Why should someone who has nothing to do with out village benefit from this project? 2-3 affordable - what are the others?
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural ground and should not be used as residential. Not necessary as Chelston Rise is prime for increase in houses.
AR, AT	Reject	I believe such a scale of development would not be in keeping with the surrounding area/villages and may over time cause the amalgamation of the village, which due to size I would not like
AR, AT	Reject	I do not live in Chelveston but feel those living around the developments may be affected
AR, AT	Reject	must not go ahead .it does not meet any of the original or present criteria!!
AR, AT	Reject	no more development in Chelston Rise
AR, AT	Reject	out of character to area and insufficient size to accommodate
AR, AT	Reject	Plot too crowded
AR, AT	Reject	Plot too smallfor 6-8 homes that would be in keeping with current family (plots)
AR, AT	Reject	Poor access on a bend. This could create a dangerous situation with vehicles moving onto a busy road.
AR, AT	Reject	The chelston rise complex already gives rise to high volumes of traffic to caldecott. it would add nothing to the village but would take away green space

NDP-S014 Allen 6-8 Mews Dwellings around a courtyard

AR, AT	Reject	The entrance to this could be dangerous as it is straight onto a bend and an ever increasing busy road. 6-8 houses are proposed. It is too many in relation to the existing number of houses in Caldecott.
AR, AT	Reject	There is no need to add more houses to this area. The view coming out of Caldecott would be spoilt by that large amount of affordable housing. Also, if the housing is affordable, then surely the people who will want to live there would not be able to run a car all the time just to go to the shop, or to do anything.
AR, AT	Reject	this is agricultural land
AR, AT	Reject	This very small site has been classed as agricultural ground in open countryside and should not be developed for residential use.
AU	Reject	Affordable dwellings' is a very vague description which doesn't give enough information for me to support it.
AU	Reject	Already been turned down once
AU	Reject	Area very small, area directly on bend of road with cars hitting blind spots. No pedestrian walkways.
AU	Reject	Because I support "some" building on the old school grounds and the above would not fit in with the surroundings
AU	Reject	Chelston Rise is almost a village in itself, with a good community feel but has room for a few carefully designed/built houses that are affordable to newcomers & existing tenants. No more as the 'green' areas are most enjoyable
AU	Reject	Dangerous entrance & plot it too small for 8 houses
AU	Reject	IN MY OPINION, THE CURRENT PLAN IS NOT SUITABLE. PERHAPS TWO HOUSES WOULD BE BETTER. I CANNOT SEE THE SITE BEING PRACTICAL FOR MORE THAN THAT AND STILL RETAINING THE CHARACTER OF THE VILLAGE.
AU	Reject	It is too small and would become too crowded with traffic
AU	Reject	It would ruin the view we have from our window.
AU	Reject	Land size will not support development proposed. Green field site - natural habitat.
AU	Reject	No - sewage and poor access which is not suitable to highway standards
AU	Reject	Not in keeping with the local area, unsafe access point, development isn't wanted in the area, would increase congestion on local roads. Would involve over development of a very small piece of land.
AU	Reject	Poor access as on bend of road
AU	Reject	Previously rejected - no difference!!
AU	Reject	Sufficient development in chelston rise, once a nature reserve never been occupied.
AU	Reject	That area is small & will encourage more traffic & unnecessary housing. I do not want properties n this area

NDP-S014	Allen	6-8 Mews Dwellings around a courtyard
AU	Reject	The bend is far too dangerous to have extra houses put in that site. cars speed along this road as it is, and you very often hear screeching of brakes as it is, so with a junction being there, would make it more dangerous
AU	Reject	There is no need for this as plenty of dwellings will e available in Higham, Rushden, Raunds, etc. This is purely to make money and will bring nothing to the locality. The entrance would be on a bend. No services, etc.
AU	Reject	this area is not suitable for this number of properties
AU	Reject	this is a very tight corner on a very busy road access would be open to accidents , with multiple cars & delivery lorries try to gain access the houses- no suitable drainage on site
AU	Reject	This is not enough room for this amount of housing and the entrance is on a blind bend
AU	Reject	Too many dwellings out of character with the area. A dangerous and fast bending road not good for access
AU	Reject	Too small an area for 6-8 houses. plus the entrance is on a dangerous bend in the road the traffic already speeds along here, so it is just an accident waiting to happen
AU	Reject	Very bad access point, increased congestion, increased noise pollution, land too small for plan proposed. Applicant has made application for travellers site in the past.
AU	Reject	Village & green areas would be lost. good sense of community would also possibly be lost
AU	Reject	We do not support low cost housing as this may attract undesirable residents.
AU	Reject	We have lovely views don't need houses spoiling it
AU	Reject	Would effect the wildlife
AU	Reject	Would like it to remain safe and small.
AB, AS, AY	No Opinion	Chelston Rise proposition more than covers the housing requirements for the area
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	No Opinion	No view
AQ, AW	No Opinion	I have insufficient knowledge of this area to make a valid judgement due to short residency in the village.

NDP-S015 Craythorn 1 dwelling accessed from Water Lane

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	155 (136 with no comments)
Conditional Support	15 (2 with no comments)
Reject	163 (93 with no comments)
No Opinion	17 (17 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S015

Post Code	NDP-S015 Votes	NDP-S015 Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	1 dwelling acceptable and will not affect anyone else
AB, AS, AY	Support	Acceptable development
AB, AS, AY	Support	It must blend well.
AB, AS, AY	Support	Not affecting anyone No impact on the village
AD, AE	Support	No excess traffic. Behind other properties
AF, AG, AP	Support	I can see this being a really nice house and I think it would make a great addition to the village.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Tucked away out of sight
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	I see no reason to object.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Looks OK.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	No problem.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	One house is ok, although again would this set a precedent for more being built on that field in the future?
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	One house only.
AQ, AW	Support	Good
AQ, AW	Support	No problems.
AQ, AW	Support	One additional dwelling would have no detrimental impact on the village.
AQ, AW	Support	This would not be too imposing
AU	Support	As long as the buildings do not impede on surrounding properties then this proposal is suitable.
AU	Support	No flooding, I like the idea of smaller developments here and there

NDP-S015	Craythorn	1 dwelling accessed from Water Lane
AU	Support	Only if in keeping with houses around
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	As long as proper access is sorted out
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	But where is the access going to be.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Providing only one unit was built and access was available.
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Again property to be in keeping with surrounding buildings and construction traffic accounted for
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	more details on access
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Access to Water Lane only.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Only as a single development
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	the relative access to 1xdwelling is sympathetic and interfaces with existing access in Water Lane. The footpath access should not be impacted.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	If one dwelling
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	If there were no plans for further development
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Would need to rethink access
AU	Conditional Support	If it is only one fairly sized dwelling keeping to the rest of the properties
AU	Conditional Support	My only concern on this proposition is access to the property but otherwise feel that this would fit in with the village
AD, AE	Conditional Support	
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Access issues Future unknown intentions for the development of this plot Unsustainable development for the size of plot Its a sort of back infill development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	NO NO
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Surely this is backland development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	The plot is too big for one house so I think the numbers will change. There are access issues
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No thank you Mr Craythorn
AB, AS, AY	Reject	As for previous propositions where a field is involved
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Completely wrong in every respect. Just because some land is owned, it does not mean it can be built on. This proposal fails in every material planning sense.....and the Landowner should be advised accordingly.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No on green field site
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not entirely happy with the idea of building a property that has virtually no access to it.

NDP-S015	Craythorn	1 dwelling accessed from Water Lane
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This seems too large a site for one dwelling
AD, AE	Reject	This would be a floodgate to develop the whole field.
AD, AE	Reject	Entrance to the site is an issue
AD, AE	Reject	Poor access to site
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Access issues
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Concerns for access through water yard - surface is struggling to cope with current traffic. Also concerns regarding size of plot Vs no of proposed dwelling? would more be proposed if this one gets through? probably - which would be such a shame.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I do not believe the applicant will just want one house, compared with the JST site, its larger and he is a smart man, don't trust the application!!
AF, AG, AP	Reject	It is still not clear if the owner has access. The lane leading to the field is not wide enough to take large vehicles. He would need permission from other landowners to develop.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	No proper access Extremely unlikely that it would be just one dwelling and even more unlikely that Craythorn would live there!
AF, AG, AP	Reject	There is no acceptable access to this paddock, which is tucked behind another cottage. It is backland development on a greenfield site & totally inappropriate.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This is open to possible future development intentions, plus noise disturbance to residents in the location. Also poor access, how will construction vehicles get onto land and there will be issues from workers cars/vans parking on a road which is narrow and some vehicles travel fast along road
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Unsuitable access to site
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Access
AF, AG, AP	Reject	The access to this site just is not suitable, and not in keeping with the village building houses behind other houses .
AF, AG, AP	Reject	being on higher land to dwelling would tower over other houses
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I don't like back land development where the property can't easily be accessed from the road.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Maintaining the integrity of all of Duchy Field is I believe important.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This particular area of the village should remain undeveloped. This is not infill, just out into open green space.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Unsuitable access to this proposition.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Concerned about access
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Concerned that more than one dwelling will be built. The access is not good

NDP-S015	Craythorn	1 dwelling accessed from Water Lane
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	i cannot see this work if development takes place on dutchy field
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many houses in village now
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	The site could be upgraded to include more houses
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	This is like a back land development
AQ, AW	Reject	No way unless included with site behind
AQ, AW	Reject	Access for construction traffic would have a negative impact on the adjoining land.
AQ, AW	Reject	Backland development, infringing on neighbouring properties
AQ, AW	Reject	Building even one house would have implications on further development around the property by setting a precedent for further development
AQ, AW	Reject	From my home I can view this, it will spoil the views. This is a big plot for 1 house and my suspicions are that more could be built.
AQ, AW	Reject	No access Would dominate high land Not convinced land would be used for just one property
AQ, AW	Reject	Not in line with outline of village. Ruin rural aspect. Concern site is too big for one house. Could lead to more
AQ, AW	Reject	Opens up possibility for further development as infill in adjacent field to the north. Access issues
AQ, AW	Reject	Problematic access. Obstruction of a public right of way.
AQ, AW	Reject	See no reason why development should be allowed this far outside the village boundary, access is poor and believe it would be an aspiration to gain access from Duchy Field, if developed, to deveopment further which would then be difficult to resist.
AQ, AW	Reject	The site is behind an existing development and is not infill
AQ, AW	Reject	This is not infill & access to the land is inappropriate for a dwelling, nor does it fit in with the current boundary of dwellings
AQ, AW	Reject	This will spoil everyone's view. To have a'random' house in a field? It's not in keeping to the village.
AQ, AW	Reject	We see this as an opportunity for the owner to build more than 1 house should Duchy field gain approval
AQ, AW	Reject	Would dominate over houses along Water Lane
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural land
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural land in open countryside.
AR, AT	Reject	Back development with access problems.

NDP-S015 Craythorn 1 dwelling accessed from Water Lane

AR, AT	Reject	Backland development on agricultural ground in open countryside.
AR, AT	Reject	No backfill
AR, AT	Reject	Not needed.
AR, AT	Reject	Although this may not affect me it would affect others and they may not want development. Therefore it would be inappropriate for me to make a decision that would/wouldn't affect/relate to me.
AR, AT	Reject	Poor access for vehicles and also public footpath runs up access route and across field
AR, AT	Reject	This does not achieve anything. One dwelling in the middle of a field does not represent an inclusive development.
AR, AT	Reject	unappealing and will restrict current views
AR, AT	Reject	Usable farm land being destroyed.
AR, AT	Reject	Although the proposal for a low impact building is reassuring the location with regards access and its location to the field (Carr) adjacent means it is unsuited to development currently.
AR, AT	Reject	House in middle of field behind other properties possibly then may encourage further building in fields and open lands.
AU	Reject	Building in the middle of the field makes me think that more houses will be built around it. It does not seem to add anything to local environ.
AU	Reject	Going out into important open spaces
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	To many building. It is suppose to be a small village.
AU	Reject	Too many houses already
AU	Reject	Use of open field
AU	Reject	Uses a field.
AU	Reject	Would not look right and access would not be good

[NDP-S017](#) Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - 6 Bungalows accessed off Britten Close

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	119 (92 with no comments)
Conditional Support	36 (2 with no comments)
Reject	180 (109 with no comments)
No Opinion	15 (15 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S017

Post Code	NDP-S017 Votes	NDP-S017 Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	As long as they are not exclusive should be affordable
AB, AS, AY	Support	I support this as the impact is low on the village
AB, AS, AY	Support	The only proposal I am able to give my full support to. All the benefits make sense whilst those against appear weak and without foundation
AB, AS, AY	Support	This is a good idea to have some smaller buildings in the village.
AB, AS, AY	Support	This proposal has benefits which I feel most villagers support & cannot result in more development later
AB, AS, AY	Support	This seems a reasonable scheme with a reasonable number/type of dwellings proposed
AB, AS, AY	Support	Very sensible use of surplus gardens. Unobtrusive. No impact on traffic in the village
AD, AE	Support	Adds housing for elderly who want to stay
AD, AE	Support	As long as they are affordable
AD, AE	Support	I do have concerns about more traffic on Raunds Road, particularly in the Britten Close turning with children crossing the roads for school buses.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Good infill of available land
AF, AG, AP	Support	I have always said that we need a spread of housing types. This development seems to address this.
AF, AG, AP	Support	This would give an acceptable opportunity for the village to maintain a good mix of ages and ethnic origins in village
AF, AG, AP	Support	Would provide additional housing without detracting from the nature of the village. Provides additional style of housing enabling current village residents to downsize.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Because I think there is a demand for small bungalows
AQ, AW	Support	No problems.
AQ, AW	Support	Sensible re-use of land within the existing village boundary.

NDP-S017 Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - 6 Bungalows accessed off Britten Close

AQ, AW	Support	This in-fill is in keeping with the character of the village.
AQ, AW	Support	With ageing population I think the bungalows would be a sensible addition
AR, AT	Support	Would add a good mix of properties to the village with little impact on surrounding properties.
AR, AT	Support	Would add a variation of properties to the village without affecting surrounding properties.
AU	Support	I like the idea of smaller varied developments
AU	Support	I support this proposition as I feel we need a mix of homes some for young people and some for older residents
AU	Support	Ideal location for retirement bungalows
AU	Support	in fill use of existing garden
AU	Support	It is fair to build retirement bungalows. Keep them looking the same as the rest of the road!
AU	Support	This does not affect the village boundary.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Access would need to be from the side of number one Britten Close and not from between numbers two and three. Possible objections due to 'back-fill'
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	But access not from Britten Close
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	fewer properties
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Only if access from Kimbolton Road - no alteration to Britten Close
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Proposing two new access roads off Britten Close is unrealistic and not likely to get Highways support. Six dwellings would increase vehicle movements on the Close significantly. If a new access road was created off the Raunds Road, serving all six properties, then that could be acceptable.
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Fewer properties
AD, AE	Conditional Support	If no of houses reduced to 3
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	I am not in favour of properties being built in back gardens behind existing properties where the access is as described, I would support if there was better access, not from Britten Close.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	I would only support this proposition if the proposed bungalows were "Back to back" with the remaining Britten Close properties and if access was from Kimbolton Road or Raunds Road. I would not support this as a "back land" development accessed from Britten Close.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	No bungalows
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	4 in conjunction with proposed development of field in Raunds Rd, and access was from Raunds Rd, not Britten Close.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	6 is too many
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Britten Close is a very quiet cul-de-sac. Access to 6 bungalows would need road structure from Raunds Road or Kimbolton Road to gain access

NDP-S017 Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - 6 Bungalows accessed off Britten Close

AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Fewer dwellings commensurate with local need and only if traffic implications minimal and safe
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Fewer than 6 bungalows
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Maximum 2 bungalows
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	No access off Kimbolton Road
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	OK if the trees stop in position.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Only bungalows as view aspect and would like to see more info on access before forming an opinion
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Would prefer to see access from either Raunds Rd or Kimbolton Road to prevent building houses behind houses with potential isolation. Access to the proposed six bungalows needs to be carefully considered.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	3 bungalows only
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	3-4 properties maximum
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	An additional 6 houses in this area seems to be too many. 3 might be more appropriate
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	The land being built on is too vast, a reduction of new builds and land taken up needs to be reconsidered
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	unobtrusive, but perhaps four houses would be more appropriate.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	give retired people easier access to surrounding towns eg:buses.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Maximum of 3. I am unsure where the access would be.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	possibly only 3 bungalows
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Possibly two dwellings. Three too many
AU	Conditional Support	Full details on access etc.
AU	Conditional Support	Loss of green land & woodlands. However would these be specifically for the elderly & available to other village residents.
AU	Conditional Support	Loss of green land. Would be specifically for elderly & would they be affordable to older village residents - rent?
AU	Conditional Support	MAXIMUM OF 4 BUNGALOWS
AU	Conditional Support	Re quality of after build when maintained ie: upkeep of social care
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	

NDP-S017 Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - 6 Bungalows accessed off Britten Close

AB, AS, AY	Reject	Do not support back infill development Cash grabbing Unsuitable access Spoils the character of these houses and the neighbourhood
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Don't feel it is the sort of housing which the village needs
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I do not like backfilling/garden development. I think this is a case of making money and then leaving the village.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	NO NO NO NO BACK FILL GARDEN GRABBING
AB, AS, AY	Reject	NO NO NO NO MOVE IT IS GARDEN GRABBING
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I take into consideration how their neighbours feel. I do not believe in people profiteering from their land at the detriment of their fellow residents. this is unacceptable.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	The land proposed to be built on was classed as fallow land by the builders so should never be built on, there would be potentially be quite an increase in the flow of traffic trying to get out of Britten Close which at peak times is bad enough now, it would be far safer if approved, for the proposed site to have access onto Raunds Road over Keith Carr's land at NDP-S008
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This is a ridiculous idea to completely destroy the look of Britten Close by knocking down garages to accommodate another 6 properties and a new road. What about the services and overcrowding of vehicles on an already small road. The whole balance would be destroyed.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Traffic accidents Raunds Rd/Britten Close
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Two more access points from Britten Close which would double traffic access to a cul de sac
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Why do the village want 6 Bungalows don't think so what about the traffic flows, by the time the Bungalows are built Mr Bagley will be long gone
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Would be far to overcrowded. Nice cul-de-sac as it is. Think they are being greedy!! Move if the gardens are too big. Let someone else have the luxury of a nice big garden. Not acceptable! More traffic in a nice quiet area
AD, AE	Reject	Garden backfill & also the exit from Britten Close to the Raunds Road
AD, AE	Reject	I do not feel this offers anything extra to the village.
AD, AE	Reject	Plan is not clear re access to dwellings. It also would mean an excessive number of properties accessing a small cul de sac.
AD, AE	Reject	Plan unclear as far as access goes. Excessive number of properties accessing a small cul de sac.
AD, AE	Reject	Too many dwellings already. Keep Chelveston a small village
AD, AE	Reject	Will be houses with no house frontage for access and services with traffic turning out from dangerous junction with Raunds Road. How can they be guaranteed as retirement homes

NDP-S017 Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - 6 Bungalows accessed off Britten Close

AF, AG, AP	Reject	Access Issues
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Access issues
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Again building houses behind other houses in gardens is not in keeping with the village.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Again too many
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Back land development, not enough thought put into cars and access and too many assumptions about the types of people who would buy these proposed properties.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I cannot see why gardens need to have houses built on them, unless there is a really good reason. Having a large garden really is not sufficient reason. It is inappropriate.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	In my opinion this would cause issues for neighbours due to increased traffic
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Out of context, access not clear.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	There will be traffic issues for residents in this small close
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too cramped. Poor access
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Access to layby
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Access to the chelveston & raunds road& also the layby
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Again too big for Britten Close.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I don't think this is as good a development as many others proposed in that it would reduce the value of the three existing houses unreasonably and create cramped accommodation for the new houses.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Ridiculous increase of traffic in Britten Close
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	this is backland development for personal gain and not village enhancement
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	This would affect the cul-de-sac far too much, too much traffic and far too much impact on existing residents
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Unnecessary over development of current sites and financially motivated
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Would spoil existing houses and create cramped accommodation - nobody would be happy.
AQ, AW	Reject	Bad
AQ, AW	Reject	Behind current houses Traffic concerns

NDP-S017 Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - 6 Bungalows accessed off Britten Close

AQ, AW	Reject	Britain Close is a small development already and does not need another development within. Any need for retirement bungalows can be met elsewhere. Completely out of character with existing development. Access issues.
AQ, AW	Reject	Britten Close is a lovely quiet cul-de-sac. This is too much and seems unnecessary. Smaller houses are available for residents to move to in the village. They are lovely big houses with generous plots which should remain. Any family would love to purchase one of these.
AQ, AW	Reject	I am against back garden development.
AQ, AW	Reject	I don't want people developing their back gardens
AQ, AW	Reject	It just should not be about individuals making money
AQ, AW	Reject	Not in line with Britten Close. Isolated development? Traffic issues. 12 + cars in Britten Close
AQ, AW	Reject	The access is completely inadequate, the reason I believe why the gardens were so big to begin with.
AQ, AW	Reject	There is no reason why you should put a house in a garden. I personally would love a big garden. If the garden is too much for the owners, then move and sell to a family which will appreciate a good size garden.
AQ, AW	Reject	There should be a mixture of housing within a village and there will always be a demand for housing with larger garden requirements which should not be lost to the village
AQ, AW	Reject	This is not right for old people, access is a problem. Concerns access could come off the layby if other scheme approved. Security issues of houses behind other houses.
AQ, AW	Reject	This would not be in keeping with this small development. Are retirement homes needed in Chelveston, a village with no public transport or facilities.
AQ, AW	Reject	Too dense
AQ, AW	Reject	Traffic concerns
AQ, AW	Reject	Will double the traffic in Britten Close
AR, AT	Reject	Access problematic
AR, AT	Reject	It would make the existing houses unappealing having bungalows in existing green space.
AR, AT	Reject	Britten Close would have been developed initially with more houses. There is no need to change it now. I cannot understand why someone would buy a house with a large garden with a view to building on it. This is unfair to existing residents. Additionally, I do not think Britten Close could accommodate more through vehicles. This would increase the noise to existing residents. 6 dwellings are too many for this area. Also, are dwellings required for retired people? It is a bit remote at the back of Britten Close. Retired (older) people need to be nearer to facilities.
AR, AT	Reject	No backfill. Roadside development only.
AR, AT	Reject	Over development

NDP-S017 Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - 6 Bungalows accessed off Britten Close

AR, AT	Reject	Although this may not affect me it would affect others and they may not want development. Therefore it would be inappropriate for me to make a decision that would/wouldn't affect/relate to me.
AR, AT	Reject	i cannot vote on area that doesnt affect me but my vote willaffect others more local to it.
AR, AT	Reject	There are enough houses in Britten Close. Why were these houses not built when Britten Close was originally designed? I can only assume it was not deemed the correct thing to do. I do not like the idea of houses behind houses and cannot see how this development would enhance the village as a whole. Also, what about the access through Britten Close? This would make this cul-de-sac much busier. To me this development just does not work or benefit anyone other than the current residents making a financial gain.
AU	Reject	Again laking away our countryside, open spaces, creating more cars + busier villages.
AU	Reject	Again to many, in an already built up area
AU	Reject	As mentioned before, I feel the JST proposal would enhance the village more, and would be enough of an increase in dwellings for Chelveston
AU	Reject	As the Shaws the would have to demolish some building to achieve
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	No more houses and not enough parking already.
AU	Reject	The plan show access will be an issue without demolising existing buildings.
AU	Reject	This is another garden grabbing development and should not be allowed as it would ruin the area in my opinion. There are better sites to develop and this would make the area look over developed
AU	Reject	This is garden grabbing and believe it would have a adverses affect on the surrounding dwellings. I also do not appreciate the fact that fliers were put through all residents doors asking for their approval. In my opinion this is in appropriate and under hand.

NDP-S018a Mommersteeg 3 detached dwellings Caldecott Road

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	144 (110 with no comments)
Conditional Support	20 (1 with no comments)
Reject	171 (103 with no comments)
No Opinion	15 (13 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S018a

Post Code	NDP-S018a Votes	NDP-S018a Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	I feel this is still'in-fill' in the village
AB, AS, AY	Support	If we must accept expansion! it must be sympathetic to the surroundings and not just to make a buck!
AB, AS, AY	Support	This is a great location to live view across the paddock
AB, AS, AY	Support	To be built in stone
AB, AS, AY	Support	They have a lot of land
AD, AE	Support	I think this is well planned and offers a good addition to the village
AD, AE	Support	to be built to keep in character of village. Will join Caldecott with the church
AF, AG, AP	Support	Another small development that simply extends a current row of housing, keeping Chelveston at a similar size with similar housing.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Consideration has been given to the type of property and materials to be used so as to blend in with existing properties.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Good infill within the village
AF, AG, AP	Support	It's basically in-fill so no objection
AF, AG, AP	Support	The location of these properties would blend with the current location, still maintaining a well used footpath and church access.
AF, AG, AP	Support	With the other developments providing smaller and more affordable housing this would provide the balance in some more substantial houses, as long as the footpath is maintained.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Attractive additions to village if done as proposed
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Would add to Caldecott. Sounds attractive.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Would prefer 2 houses and 1 bungalow option

NDP-S018a	Mommersteeg	3 detached dwellings Caldecott Road
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	It will link Caldecott towards Chelveston church and hall
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Would not appear out of place in given location
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Would prefer to see 2 houses and one bungalow ,but three houses would also be in keeping
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Doesn't appear to affect many others
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Looks like a reasonable proposal.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	This completes a reasonable development for this area.
AQ, AW	Support	Again this would be a good area to develop due to linking Caldecott together. Also the houses proposed are sensible with nice gardens - a good family home and in keeping with current houses.
AQ, AW	Support	Good
AQ, AW	Support	In keeping with proposed developments surrounding.
AQ, AW	Support	Preferably with the bungalow.
AQ, AW	Support	Three properties with paddocks would be desirable as there is a lack of this type of residence
AR, AT	Support	Too many houses being proposed within Caldecott. The development of Duchy Farm at present is sufficient within the area.
AR, AT	Support	We don't like to argue
AU	Support	Good use of in fill,lining the road and not in open fields
AU	Support	In keeping with the existing properties in village
AU	Support	Infill proposal.
AU	Support	This and 18b cover both phases 2016-2025 and 2025-2035
AU	Support	Will link Caldecott together and improve the village
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	IT GOES WITH THE PROPERTY.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Houses an bungalow
AD, AE	Conditional Support	as above
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	I would like to see smaller properties.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	If two houses and one bungalow built
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	One house might be acceptable but 3 is too many in this area
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Would prefer two houses & one bungalow

NDP-S018a	Mommersteeg	3 detached dwellings Caldecott Road
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	more detailed investigation in traffic increase in view of other developments in the area
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Needs to be looked at in conjunction with other developments to review traffic impact
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	2 properties only should be permitted with double garages and further off road parking.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Three houses only. I dislike bungalows
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Fewer dwellings - max 3
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Three bungalows. The village has not got many large detached bungalows.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	bidwell lane needs major work doing to it to cope
AR, AT	Conditional Support	I would support the building of 1 house or bungalows adjacent to Church House where the access is safer. More properties on a greenfield site with access close to the bend I would not support.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	I feel 2 houses and a bungalow would enable a mix of residents. Affordable Housing
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Would prefer similarly affordable housing as per proposal changes under NDP-S001 at top of page 3 here in
AU	Conditional Support	as long as the end result is in keeping with the surrounding area.
AU	Conditional Support	Three detached houses.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Again not affordable housing
AB, AS, AY	Reject	As already stated building on farm field land which could lead to further houses
AB, AS, AY	Reject	To keep as a village
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Does not provide a mix of housing for the village.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	it would be a shame to lose this field to housing
AB, AS, AY	Reject	It would be filling in open countryside and Caldecott would become less attractive
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Keep the same as it is at this time
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Loss of large visible green area changing feel of village whilst travelling through.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	My reasons for saying no this is purely a personal reason - [reason removed]
AB, AS, AY	Reject	no development on greenfield sites
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No further development wanted in Caldecott Removes green space
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	THE PADDOCK GOES WITH HOUSE
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This site & NDP-S018b would be a large development for Caldecott

NDP-S018a	Mommersteeg	3 detached dwellings Caldecott Road
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This site is clearly in the open countryside and as such, according to the NPPF, any attempt to build on it should be strongly resisted unless material planning reasons dictate otherwise. Whilst I accept the Caldecott Road has an existing linear style of development, there is no sound material planning reason to extend that build line all the way to the Carr Barns. The current open space created by the break in the build form is an amenity that should be protected.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too much development in Caldecott already
AD, AE	Reject	Spoil view of church
AD, AE	Reject	This is a development too far by destroying a beautiful field with views of the church
AF, AG, AP	Reject	It would spoil the open vista of this part of the village which contributes to it's overall feel.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	don't see this as being of benefit to the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Feel this would be too much and would impact on neighbouring homes
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Proximity to the church
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	The fields are beautiful and the footpath is a quiet, peaceful place to walk and run; it should not be disturbed or built on
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	This is creating a cluster of houses , possible overlooking of the church. It will also interfere with the public footpath
AQ, AW	Reject	Adding to many to area.
AQ, AW	Reject	Changes the character of village in that it would join the string of properties on Caldecott Road into the main village, rather than leaving the valuable green space.
AQ, AW	Reject	I am opposed to building on land that currently does not have any dwellings or buildings available for conversion.
AQ, AW	Reject	It would appear to impose substantially on green space
AQ, AW	Reject	Land is open field and rural, not suitable for development (especially when phase 2 also taken into account).
AQ, AW	Reject	Makes corner too crowded & spoils only open view of church area
AQ, AW	Reject	Over development of rural location. Spoil the views and feel of Caldecott
AQ, AW	Reject	Public foot paths
AQ, AW	Reject	Same as above
AQ, AW	Reject	The development is too large.
AQ, AW	Reject	This is detrimental to the village. What makes our village a beautiful spot is our church and the surrounding views. The houses would spoil this
AQ, AW	Reject	This will change the character of this area of the village

NDP-S018a	Mommersteeg	3 detached dwellings Caldecott Road
AQ, AW	Reject	This would have a negative impact on the green space which affords beautiful, peaceful views from the church and from the road.
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a change
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a change to village
AQ, AW	Reject	Too many houses are being proposed for the size of the village. Drainage and water supplies may not be adequate.
AQ, AW	Reject	Would add to traffic along Caldecott Road
AR, AT	Reject	I think this would just destroy the appearance of the village
AR, AT	Reject	it would change the village unnecessarily and not add anything at all.
AR, AT	Reject	sounds like a money making proposal rather than for the good of the village !!
AR, AT	Reject	The developments currently happening in Bidwell Lane are enough for this part of Caldecott. This corner and front facing to Caldecott Road is totally rural and any building would detract from this and spoil the view of the church. The footpath would have to be relocated - this has happened before to accommodate a tennis court. Whilst walking or driving this is one of the nicest aspects of the village and I do not want to see it spoilt.
AR, AT	Reject	This is agricultural land
AR, AT	Reject	This is agricultural land and open countryside. This development would change the whole feel of the village and should not be permitted.
AR, AT	Reject	This is agricultural land and this development would spoil the village look.
AR, AT	Reject	This would completely spoil the rural space on the corner of Caldecott Road and Bidwell Lane. The driveways would go directly onto the Caldecott Road and would completely change the rural aspect of this part of Caldecott. I do not think that Caldecott needs any more detached houses at this stage. This sort of dwelling does not offer affordable housing. Peter is talking about moving the footpath again to accommodate a space to ensure a view of the church. I do wonder if this is in anticipation of further possible dwellings in the future ie: an access that would go further into the field near to the Duchy's Barn on Bidwell Lane.
AR, AT	Reject	too many houses in the village with the conversion of Duchy Farm
AR, AT	Reject	Why does there need to be more houses there? If people want to live in the village they should move to houses that are already there. I grew up in caldecott and it would be a shame to lose all the land that is there to new houses and residents that would not be able to see the true beauty of the village because their houses will have ruined that.
AU	Reject	Access to caldecott road is on a tight bend , if other properties are confirmed on bidwell lane it will make that busy corner.
AU	Reject	I am against this type of house as it is not the sort of house people in this area could afford. We need 2 bedroom starter homes.

NDP-S018a Mommersteeg 3 detached dwellings Caldecott Road

AU	Reject	I believe that this proposal would be destroying the idyllic village of Caldecott as it will fill in open areas that attract people to the area and with the barn conversions already approved would make the area look like an estate.
AU	Reject	I believe that with the already agreed development close by this would make this open part of the parish to look over developed
AU	Reject	I do not want to see the village crammed to the roadside with residential or other properties. I want to see the beauty of the land.
AU	Reject	I like the landscape and building here would take some of the characteristic from the village
AU	Reject	I think it is too many - although only 3, Caldecott is small and 3 houses is a fair amount when it is small & has enough traffic as it is
AU	Reject	It would become too crowded in the village
AU	Reject	Main road - also green area enjoyed by livestock, villagers & visitors
AU	Reject	No more buildings
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	No more infilling
AU	Reject	This is clearly an open green space, encroaching into the open countryside
AU	Reject	This would just make the road a corridor with buildings on one side and close in the environ.
AU	Reject	To be built on main road which at present is a green field, home to livestock which are enjoyed by both villagers & visitors
AU	Reject	Want it to remain a small quiet village.
AQ, AW	No Opinion	I have insufficient knowledge of this area to make a valid judgement due to short residency in the village.
AQ, AW	No Opinion	No views

NDP-S018b Mommersteeg 2 detached for 4 semi-detached dwellings on Bidwell Lane

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	145 (116 with no comments)
Conditional Support	28 (1 with no comments)
Reject	162 (97 with no comments)
No Opinion	15 (12 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S018b

Post Code	NDP-S018b Vote	NDP-S018b Comment
AB, AS, AY	Support	This is a great location to live view across the paddock
AB, AS, AY	Support	Low level housing needed for older people who wish to downsize , freeing up housing for younger people with families
AB, AS, AY	Support	This will be an asset to the village.
AB, AS, AY	Support	Would tie in nicely with the Duchy proposal
AB, AS, AY	Support	Houses and bungalow
AD, AE	Support	Bungalows, not semi bungalows probably more in keeping.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Coupled with the farm development you would have an entire new residential street round there which would be nice. As long as the conker tree stays, that is essential to the development of future generations!
AF, AG, AP	Support	No objection
AF, AG, AP	Support	Provision of bungalows adds to the variety of housing available in the village, and retains the open framework for views.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Seems an obvious infill if Duchy site goes ahead Planners to ensure high standard design and materials
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	To be inkeeping with Duchy proposals long term.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Would prefer 2 bungalows
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	As before - seems a reasonable proposal to support
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Don't feel this would impact too much on existing homes
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	2 bungalows would be more in keeping with the area

NDP-S018b	Mommersteeg	2 detached for 4 semi-detached dwellings on Bidwell Lane
AQ, AW	Support	A nice size development away from the main road.
AQ, AW	Support	Two would be better than four
AQ, AW	Support	Good
AQ, AW	Support	In keeping with surrounding developments.
AQ, AW	Support	Same as previous
AU	Support	Because they would be set off the main road through the village.
AU	Support	bungalows will be less obtrusive and would be good for retired people in the village.
AU	Support	Good use of in fill, lining the road and in open fields
AU	Support	In keeping with the existing properties in village
AU	Support	Infill proposal.
AU	Support	Not obtrusive - away from main road
AU	Support	Not obtrusive & away from the road
AU	Support	Only if detailed as this will be in keeping with existing buildings and give existing space of other buildings no compromise.
AU	Support	This and 18a cover both building phases 2016-2025 and 2026-2035
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	I would support phase 2 but I think for phase 1 it would be as shame to lose this part of the field to housing
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Fewer properties
AD, AE	Conditional Support	I would support this for 2 bungalows only
AD, AE	Conditional Support	If built in keeping with the village
AD, AE	Conditional Support	If only two detached bungalows
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	If four semi-detached bungalows
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Two properties
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Would prefer four semi-detached bungalows
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Needs to be looked at in conjunction with other developments to review traffic impact
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	2 properties only should be permitted with double garages and further off road parking.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Good infill for the village Covenant should be included to restrict additional building behind the current proposal
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	I think this proposal needs to be reviewed when the developments in the NDP-S018A and NDP-S001 have been realised. The impact of more housing is then able to be reviewed
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	have concnrs-as with soo1 regarding width and current condition of bidwell lane. any development of this site should be conditional to road improvements
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Improvement of Bidwell Lane access

NDP-S018b	Mommersteeg	2 detached for 4 semi-detached dwellings on Bidwell Lane
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	If bungalows
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	2 bungalows only
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	If house numbers were reduced to two
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Two bungalows, not four.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	A maximum of 2 bungalows, in stone and generous green gardens not concreted / paved with garages in keeping with houses.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Alterations to Bidwell Lane
AR, AT	Conditional Support	No access from Bidwell Lane as road cannot cope with any more traffic
AR, AT	Conditional Support	2 bungalows in keeping with area and size of other properties/gardens along the road.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Would prefer similarly affordable housing as per proposal changes under NDP-S001 at top of page 3 here in
AU	Conditional Support	2 bungalows.
AU	Conditional Support	As long as in keeping surroundings
AU	Conditional Support	I would support two bungalows not 4
AU	Conditional Support	Two detached bungalows.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Spoil view of church.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	As already stated building on farm field land which could lead to further houses
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Caldecott would lose open spaces. Five to seven new houses (including houses from SO18a) in this small space would not benefit Caldecott and produce too much traffic. Fourteen more residents cars plus their visitors would be too much traffic for the area.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	IT GOES WITH THE PROPERTY.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Keep the same as it is
AB, AS, AY	Reject	no development on greenfield sites
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not affordable housing
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	My reasons for saying no this is purely a personal reason - [reason removed] but I also like the road as it is now with the lovely trees and the open field that the sheep graze in - just because it is a patch of land doesn't mean it has to be built on.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This site & NDP-S018a would be a large development for Caldecott
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This site is clearly in the open countryside and as such, according to the NPPF, any attempt to build on it should be strongly resisted unless material planning reasons dictate otherwise. It is important that open countryside is protected from inappropriate development.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	TO CLOSE TO TREES

NDP-S018b	Mommersteeg	2 detached for 4 semi-detached dwellings on Bidwell Lane
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too much development in Caldecott already
AD, AE	Reject	I reject this as it will just join all groups of houses to make one long sprawl of houses
AD, AE	Reject	Spoil view of church.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	It's the bungalow situation all over again.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	The view through to the Church is worth maintaining
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This is not appropriate for the area which is undeveloped land
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Wouldn't want to lose the views of the Church and the rural feel of Bidwell Lane
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Beautiful, quiet field - it is a shame to maim the only decent walking area in the village - in a village like ours a circular walk for dog walkers etc is, in my opinion a must, this will ruin this and decimate the rural ambience
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Don't see this as being of benefit to the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I feel wuite strongly that Bidwell Lane should not be over developed
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I have supported this and the other development in this area and I think that would be enough for this area.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Over development of Bidwell Lane is a concern
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Proximity to the church
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	The other two developments here would be enough
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Unnecessary considering other buildings planned for same area.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Who on earth would want to look out at Carr`s Barns every day?
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Will overcrowd the area
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	will overcrowd the area & access to road .
AQ, AW	Reject	Adding to many to area.
AQ, AW	Reject	This is detrimental to the village. What makes out village a beautiful spot is our church and the surrounding views. The houses would spoil this
AQ, AW	Reject	I am opposed to building on land that currently does not have any dwellings or buildings available for conversion.

NDP-S018b	Mommersteeg	2 detached for 4 semi-detached dwellings on Bidwell Lane
AQ, AW	Reject	As with the previous proposal, this area of land should remain green open space to keep the beautiful, peaceful views from the Church and road which epitomise how I think the village should 'feel'.
AQ, AW	Reject	foot paths
AQ, AW	Reject	Land is open field and rural not suitable for development
AQ, AW	Reject	Not in character with the farm area.
AQ, AW	Reject	Not necessary
AQ, AW	Reject	Already 4 houses being built
AQ, AW	Reject	This application relies on Phase 1 and on NDPS001 as it fills in a gap between the 2 proposals. That would bring the number of dwellings in the proposal to 13, too many.
AQ, AW	Reject	This build is imposing on green space
AQ, AW	Reject	This would create a housing estate in a rural location. Overdevelop rural site and spoil a charming view of village church.
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a change
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a change to village
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural ground and should not be used for residential development.
AR, AT	Reject	I do not believe that bungalows are an appropriate style of building for the area. More importantly I do not wish to see development in Caldecott.
AR, AT	Reject	I think this would just destroy the appearance of the village
AR, AT	Reject	The developments currently happening in Bidwell Lane are enough for this part of Caldecott. This corner and front facing to Caldecott Road is totally rural and any building would detract from this and spoil the view of the church. The footpath would have to be relocated - this has happened before to accommodate a tennis court. Whilst walking or driving this is one of the nicest aspects of the village and I do not want to see it spoilt.
AR, AT	Reject	Only convert where there is an existing building. Not in open countryside
AR, AT	Reject	Sounds like a money making proposal rather than for the good of the village !!
AR, AT	Reject	That piece of land is simply not big enough for that quantity of houses. It would ruin the view and there would be a lot more people living in a village with no shops to provide anything for them. If the area needs more houses, build them in an area that has no other use than to be used as a building site. This part of land is used for grazing.
AR, AT	Reject	This is a rural greenfield site with established trees and views to the church.
AR, AT	Reject	This is agricultural ground in open countryside and should not be permitted. This development would spoil the whole feel of the village.
AR, AT	Reject	This is agricultural land
AR, AT	Reject	This would detract from the rural space down Bidwell Lane. I do not think that Caldecott needs this kind of dwelling over the next few years as it would not be affordable housing.

NDP-S018b Mommersteeg 2 detached for 4 semi-detached dwellings on Bidwell Lane

AR, AT	Reject	Too many houses within Caldecott with the present development of Duchy Farm.
AU	Reject	Again, I think four houses is too many for the small rural area
AU	Reject	For the same reasons as previously stated I believe that this proposal will over develop the area and ruin the feel of caldecott
AU	Reject	It would become to crowded in the village
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	No more infills
AU	Reject	This is clearly an important open space, and this development would encroach into the open countryside
AU	Reject	This would make the area look over developed and cramped on an already dangerous road
AU	Reject	Want it to remain a small village.
AD, AE	No Opinion	No too many properties on such a small plot
AQ, AW	No Opinion	I have insufficient knowledge of this area to make a valid judgement due to short residency in the village.
AQ, AW	No Opinion	No views

[NDP-S019a](#)

WPG

35 Dwellings - Chelston Rise

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	106 (80 with no comments)
Conditional Support	52 (1 with no comments)
Reject	180 (101 with no comments)
No Opinion	12 (9 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S019a

Post Code	NDP-S019a Votes	NDP-S019a Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	Ideal site for development with current infrastructure
AB, AS, AY	Support	Reluctantly!
AB, AS, AY	Support	The smaller number of dwellings would fit in better
AD, AE	Support	It will make it a viable community
AD, AE	Support	Will make good community with services
AF, AG, AP	Support	This development combined with NDP-S014 makes a natural extension to Chelston Rise. It includes a variety of housing types and provides for the possibility of some kind of village shop in the Parish.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	A reasonable extension of proposed housing in a contained area
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Prefer this option rather than the 70 homes this option would retain more of a village life
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Provided the housing to be built is of a better quality and good looking
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Subject from final approval from Parish
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	This would be high density housing so I would support this reluctantly. Would there be adequate parking?
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	This would be the maximum development for this area.
AQ, AW	Support	A nice sized estate.
AQ, AW	Support	Good
AQ, AW	Support	Like the design as similar to what is currently there
AQ, AW	Support	So long as this number is not increased.
AR, AT	Support	In conjunction with NDP-S014

NDP-S019a	WPG	35 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AR, AT	Support	Keeping the existing housing style and layout is important. Increased traffic volume through Caldecott is a major concern and measures to reduce speeding are vital.
AR, AT	Support	This would in effect mirror the current site and would create affordable housing. This area has proved popular with families and I think more families and young people should be encouraged.
AU	Support	As long as the house style is the same as now
AU	Support	I agree that there needs to be more accommodation and think that it would be better in one designated area, however I don't wish to see properties crammed so close together just for developers financial gain.
AU	Support	I support this proposal as it will not spoil Chelston Rise as it will built the same
AU	Support	in line with existing housing and should have sufficient parking for the 70+cars that will be required by the occupants.
AU	Support	Keep in the style and character of Chelston Rise. This proposal is the maximum number that should be considered
AU	Support	Matches existing style of houses (unique). sustainable - increase in vehicles on roads not overwhelming.
AU	Support	This proposition sounds good. However would like to see No's 43, 45 and 47 retained as well as the improvements to drainage, and the roads. I am also in support of a local shop
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Fewer houses
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	IF LESS
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	IF NO MORE THAN 30
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If the number of houses were reduced to around 20, then perhaps it could be considered
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Number of dwellings reduced by at least half
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Number reduced and traffic calming through Caldecott
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Affordable housing is a necessity in this area
AD, AE	Conditional Support	housing materials need to be considered as I feel the brickwork in Chelston Rise is rather unattractive.
AD, AE	Conditional Support	If limited to 20 & over 10 years
AD, AE	Conditional Support	The construction needs to be different from the existing as the "RAF style" houses are old fashioned - use of stone style brick would make it more attractive
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	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
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	As shown this is overdevelopment. I would support maximum of 22 properties with individual parking and garaging facilities. See notes to plab B below.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	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.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	It will all depend on the final design.

NDP-S019a	WPG	35 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Less density
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Lesser Density
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	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.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Do not need 35, dwellings,15-20 would be better
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	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.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	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.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Fewer dwellings taking into account local need for affordable housing
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	I would support 35 as long as the additional 70 below are not allowed.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	if it was cut down to 20 other wise too many
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	The roads and access seem unsuitable for so many users.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Facilities needed first - pathway to village - doctors etc
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	I don't see this as excessive provided the contractor implements highways improvements and awards the parish benefits
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Improvement in the road, this development could generate approximately 50 additional vehicles which the current road would struggle to accommodate.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	No objections to housing development on this site but feel that 20-25 houses would be more appropriate.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Over development of site. More low cost homes
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	speed reduction methods on all roads in chelveston needed

NDP-S019a	WPG	35 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Support some development but not on the scale proposed should complement exist not almost double the size.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	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.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	There are a number of proposals for this area and 35 houses seems to be too great a number
AR, AT	Conditional Support	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.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	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?
AR, AT	Conditional Support	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.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Prefer 20-25 dwellings to be in keeping with existing density of Chelston - consider small shop in addition
AR, AT	Conditional Support	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.
AU	Conditional Support	Buildings must be in keeping with the current properties retaining nos 43, 45 & 47 & optimise upstairs better in the end terraced
AU	Conditional Support	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
AU	Conditional Support	Far too many houses for the site and needs to be scaled down and made similar to the houses already present at chelston rise
AU	Conditional Support	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.
AU	Conditional Support	I would support a <u>maximum</u> of TEN houses to continue the 'horseshoe' 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
AU	Conditional Support	if 18 properties 2015-2020 and 17 2020 to 2035
AU	Conditional Support	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)
AU	Conditional Support	Only 20 houses
AU	Conditional Support	Only 20 houses to be built

NDP-S019a	WPG	35 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AU	Conditional Support	Smaller development 5 - 10 homes in the same style as are currently there
AU	Conditional Support	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
AU	Conditional Support	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.
AU	Conditional Support	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
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	35 houses would create 70 plus new residents cars all of which would go through Caldecott. Caldecott does not have the capacity for this. It would overwhelm the current housing Chelston Rise is a nice small development with open countryside and that is why people have moved there, increasing the housing by 35 would ruin this.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Currently an unacceptable proposal as it fall within the open countryside designation. WPG have been formally advised they will not get planning permissions (even for one dwelling) as long as the site is considered within the open countryside.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I don't consider this is a good place to build more homes which will ultimately suffer from the effects of the biomass plant & HGV traffic etc
AB, AS, AY	Reject	It's too many houses
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No - it's too many I would be concerned about extra traffic and infrastructure generally
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not enough school and doctors in area to service these houses
AB, AS, AY	Reject	over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too large development. Chelston Rise would start to dwarf Chelveston Village
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many dwellings
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many houses Traffic through Caldecott Will spoil the character of Chelston Rise
AB, AS, AY	Reject	What 70 new homes I don't think so

NDP-S019a	WPG	35 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AD, AE	Reject	Development too big for village. Creates a separate estate type development.
AD, AE	Reject	Too big a development for the village. Creates a separate development, verging on estate.
AD, AE	Reject	Too many houses will bring about further unwelcome changes to the village
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Allocation of dwelling is established within the village
AF, AG, AP	Reject	As we desperately need more houses nationally this would seem to be a waste of an opportunity
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I feel this is too many properties in an area which has 50 dwellings already. Also its potential would/could expand into other large scale developments seen as 'acceptable'
AF, AG, AP	Reject	The only place that I believe is suitable is the land where the school was situated, which would only take 6-8 houses. Also the road is only a 'C' class road which would not be suitable for an extra 60-70 vehicles. It does not have any facilities either
AF, AG, AP	Reject	There is enough development at Chelston Rise and do people really want to look at 'ugly turbines'??
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too large a development
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too many for such a small community in one go.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too many properties - the site would become too large and induce more traffic
AF, AG, AP	Reject	totally out of character with the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Chelston Rise is a unique housing estate and does not need to become a town on its own
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Caldecott is complete at present.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Chelston Rise is a small friendly community and does not need to be expanded. It will only make for a larger village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No infrastructure to support existing development let alone anymore.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Not within the existing boundary
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Roads inadequate for extra traffic.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Roads not adequate.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	To large deveopment increasing traffic and taking away open space.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too big an increase

NDP-S019a	WPG	35 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many houses
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	too many houses
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	too many houses for this tiny village
AQ, AW	Reject	Do we want to urbanise the airfield with a hugh housing estate?
AQ, AW	Reject	Far to many houses.
AQ, AW	Reject	Infrastructure cannot sustain this type of development, i.e. roads, drains etc.
AQ, AW	Reject	Scale of proposed development is too great this is not infill but almost a doubling of the existing community at Chelston Rise
AQ, AW	Reject	There are more than enough houses at Chelston Rise
AQ, AW	Reject	This plan imposes too much on green space and is a large plan for a small area
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a development
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a development
AQ, AW	Reject	Too large!
AQ, AW	Reject	Too much growth
AQ, AW	Reject	Too remote a site for large development. Leave as it is.
AR, AT	Reject	Greenfield site
AR, AT	Reject	Already issues with using Bidwell Lane as a rat run
AR, AT	Reject	Chelston Rise is not close enough to Chelveston or Caldecott to benefit from any developments
AR, AT	Reject	Definitely do not want the village expanding by this much!
AR, AT	Reject	Far too big a development for the area and would completely change the character of the village
AR, AT	Reject	Far too many houses. In appropriate.
AR, AT	Reject	Its absolutely ridiculous that in the last 10 years caldecott has been the victim of many propositions, people live here for a reason and they do not need it ruined by this amount of houses. The traffic would increase. It would no longer be a pleasant and quiet place to live with pretty views, because there would be new build ugly houses everywhere and a huge amount of people.
AR, AT	Reject	money making scam that will create havoc in the form of massivetrafficinvasion into caldecott.
AR, AT	Reject	no requirment for these houses.they would add no benefit to the existing village and add to the traffic and change the area unnecessarily
AR, AT	Reject	Outrageous size of development in a rural setting
AR, AT	Reject	overdevelopment

NDP-S019a	WPG	35 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AR, AT	Reject	We are only just getting used to these houses being occupied. The traffic increase is awful I think. 5-10 more houses in the future would be acceptable but not at the moment.
AU	Reject	Absolutely NOT - At present there are 50 houses in Chelston Rise, putting in 35 would increase the development by 70%. I am not a NIMBY, and putting say 9 houses, on the footprint of where the American School, would be an option I would have no problem . If this amount of houses were put in it, with an average 2 cars per household, plus visitors, delivery and service vehicles, Chelston Rise could see an extra 350-400 traffic movements per day. The infrastructure of the mains water and sewage system, and already poor internet service would not cope
AU	Reject	BACK TO THE DRAWING BOARD FOR THIS ONE. IF THE ENTIRE SITE HAD AN ADDITIONAL 12 HOUSES ONLY. THERE'S NO NEED FOR A SHOP OR ANY ADDITIONAL ACCESS PATH.PLEASE DO NOT CONSIDER ANY PROPOSAL OF THIS SCALE AS IT WOULD GREATLY DESTROY THE CHARACTER OF THE CURRENT SITE. ANY ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE IDENTICAL TO CURRENT HOUSES. 12 MAXIMUM
AU	Reject	Further housing not wanted. Would ruin the rural, friendly atmosphere of the estate. Would increase local congestion, noise pollution and air pollution.
AU	Reject	I moved for a village & rural living Building would ruin the views & countryside. I don't want to be living in a town again
AU	Reject	I would rather 5-10 houses
AU	Reject	Lovely estate, will ruin it
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	No need for this development. People moved here to get away from estates and all this being built in Rushden, Higham. The local infrastructure would not take such an influx and is not needed. WPG just want to make as much money - and RUN
AU	Reject	The development would upset and destroy the quiet and rural feeling the estate has; there would also be an increase in congestion on local roads and through caldecott; the development is not wanted by chelston rise residents. The plans of the developer appeared unclear at the proposal meeting, with the possibility they could link up adjoining land owned by other developers. They also could not answer basic questions on the proposed plans. The developers want to introduce amenities such as a shop etc, these are again not wanted. Residents have moved here to get away from urban life.
AU	Reject	this is a greenfield site, and should remain unaltered.if the proposal was for a maximum of 10 housesbuilt in the same style of the existing houses i would support that

NDP-S019a	WPG	35 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AU	Reject	This proposal does nothing to enhance either Chelston Rise or Caldecott. The area is not suitable for such a large development of this nature & the suggested 'sweeteners' as proposed by William Pears Group is of no consequence to the householders at Chelston Rise. There is no need or requirement for a children's play area. Furthermore how many affordable homes do they propose to build
AU	Reject	Too large and nothing in keeping with existing development. Most residents on Chelston Rise live here specifically because it is very rural
AU	Reject	Too many houses - would swamp the existing residents and additional traffic with no facilities
AU	Reject	Too many houses for the size of space and it would mean knocking down some of the houses already there
AU	Reject	Too many houses would mean Chelston Rise would become distant & lose its community feel. Many privately owned houses have taken parts of green areas so residents cannot enjoy green walkways
AU	Reject	Too many houses would probably mean that Chelston Rise would become distant & lose the community feel it has built up over the past 3 years. Several privately owned houses have already 'pinched' green walkways so other residents are unable to enjoy
AU	Reject	We moved to area for village location. Building on this land would ruin any views, quietness or countryside feel it would be like living in a town.
AU	Reject	Would like to keep the countryside views and space for our children to play.
AU	Reject	Would rather a smaller development
AB, AS, AY	No Opinion	Too many dwellings
AQ, AW	No Opinion	the village cannot sustain this amount of new houses. It is not just about people making money. I would hope anyway
AU	No Opinion	Not allowed to object, due to covenants in my deeds that prevent me from objecting.

NDP-S019b WPG 70 Dwellings - Chelston Rise

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	13 (10 with no comments)
Conditional Support	12 (0 with no comments)
Reject	317 (158 with no comments)
No Opinion	8 (7 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S019b

Post Code	NDP-S019b Votes	NDP-S019b Comments
AD, AE	Support	Do not mind 35 or 70 houses
AD, AE	Support	Do not mind which
AF, AG, AP	Support	As we desperately need more houses nationally this would seem to be a waste of an opportunity
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	IF NO MORE THAN 30
AD, AE	Conditional Support	If limited to 20 & over 10 years
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	There were only 35 houses
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Guarantee of a single dwelling
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Too many
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Too many dwellings that don't appear to compliment existing ratio
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Too many!
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	35 houses seems to be too many for this area and this proposal is for twice that quantity.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Over development of site
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Speed reduction needed in village
AU	Conditional Support	A ridiculous number of houses for the site and they need to be os same style and build as is already on the estate.
AU	Conditional Support	A silly amount of houses proposed for this site and believe they should be the same style and build as those already at chelston rise

NDP-S019b	WPG	70 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AB, AS, AY	Reject	70 houses would create 140 plus new residents cars all of which would go through Caldecott. Caldecott does not have the capacity for this. It would overwhelm the current housing Chelston Rise is a nice small development with open countryside and that is why people have moved there, increasing the housing by 70 would ruin this.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not enough school and doctors in area to service these houses
AB, AS, AY	Reject	It's too many houses
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I don't consider this is a good place to build more homes which will ultimately suffer from the effects of the biomass plant & HGV traffic etc
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No - it's too many I would be concerned about extra traffic and infrastructure generally
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many houses Traffic through Caldecott Will spoil the character of Chelston Rise
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Far too high a density, more than double the amount of existing properties. The entire character of Chelston Rise would be changed forever. Currently, the applicant is aware planning permissions will not be granted as the site is considered to be in the open countryside.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I feel the additional 35 houses is far more than the % expansion for the village over the 20 year period.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Rather see smaller number of houses
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Ridiculous number of houses proposed
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This would make village too big
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This would over develop the site
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too large a development. Would be larger than Chelveston Village.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too large, not keeping with existing community.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many
AB, AS, AY	Reject	too many dwellings
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many dwellings
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many extra properties in a short time.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many new properties proposed
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many!

NDP-S019b	WPG	70 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many Caldecott could not support such numbers - roads etc
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too much growth too fast
AB, AS, AY	Reject	What 70 new homes not 35 no thank you
AD, AE	Reject	Too many houses will bring about further unwelcome changes to the village
AD, AE	Reject	No too many properties, would spoil Chelston Rise
AD, AE	Reject	Development too big for village. Creates a separate estate type development.
AD, AE	Reject	Too big a development for the village. Creates a separate development, verging on estate.
AD, AE	Reject	The local roads are not fit for purpose to take a large development of this style
AD, AE	Reject	too much traffic on local country roads
AF, AG, AP	Reject	35 + 8 new houses is enough. This is too many houses
AF, AG, AP	Reject	70 is too many houses to be sustainable and would be too much growth.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Allocation of dwellings is established within the village
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too many properties - the site would become too large and induce more traffic
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Building this many houses in one area will upset the layout of the neighbouring estate and the two would contrast largely. Also this many new residence in the village is too much of a rapid expansion, small gradual developments around the village is what I prefer to see.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Doubling the size is inappropriate
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too many for such a small community in one go.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	There is enough development at Chelston Rise and do people really want to look at 'ugly turbines'??
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This is total overdevelopment. What are they trying to do. Is it to get this rejected in the hope of falling back on plan A. In effect they are trying to create a whole new village whilst putting in very little.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This many additional houses would be detrimental to the village community
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This proposal is way above 10% set by the authorities
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This would impact the traffic using a road leading to Caldecott which does not have a defined footpath for walkers. The road is seen as a speeding opportunity already. This will only increase this.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This would more than double the housing on the site & is inappropriate & totally out of character for the village.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	To many houses
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too big
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too large
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too large a development
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too many houses
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too many new buildings

NDP-S019b	WPG	70 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too many properties.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too much density
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Yet again this proposal is way above the 10% set by the authorities. If approved there would be an extra 120/140 vehicles on top of the ones ref NDP-S019a 'C' type road, poor facilities, e.g. bus route etc. NDP-S019a and NDP-S019b would create a small town, which is not needed as Raunds, Rushden and Higham are meeting the extra demand in this area
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No infrastructure to support existing development let alone anymore.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Roads inadequate for extra traffic.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Chelston Rise is a unique housing estate and does not need to become a town on its own
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Far too dense a project for the type of countryside in which it would sit. How to create an urban jungle in one money-grabbing move.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Far too large, would overwhelm the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Far too many dwellings
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Far too many houses (more than double reasonable).
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Far too many houses for the site and have indicated support for lesser number
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I have supported the application for 35 properties, 70 is far too many as there are no facilities for all these extra people
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I have supported the application for 35 properties, 70 is far too many as there are no facilities for all these extra people
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Much too many
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No! This would definitely have a town feel about it and developers seem to be cramming too many homes into this space

NDP-S019b	WPG	70 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Over development of land within existing boundary
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Road not adequate.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	To large deveopment increasing traffic and taking away open space.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Chelston Rise is a small friendly community and does not need to be expanded. It will only make for a larger village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many houses for this tiny village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many dwellings
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many houses
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	too many houses
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	too many houses for size of present community
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	will overcrowd the area
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Would over-run Caldecott. Far too many houses.
AQ, AW	Reject	70 is too many
AQ, AW	Reject	Do we want to urbanise the airfield with a hugh housing estate?
AQ, AW	Reject	There are more than enough houses at Chelston Rise
AQ, AW	Reject	Bad
AQ, AW	Reject	Far to many houses.
AQ, AW	Reject	Far too big for the area.
AQ, AW	Reject	Far too many houses.!!!
AQ, AW	Reject	Fine too large a development over doubling the existing. Support some development but not on the scale proposed should complement exist not over double the size.

NDP-S019b	WPG	70 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AQ, AW	Reject	I feel that this is far too large a development in an area with other proposed developments. It would completely alter the nature of the area.
AQ, AW	Reject	NDP-S019A proposition of 35 dwellings will be more suitable for the traffic flow on the roadway than the 70 dwellings as proposed on NDP-S019B
AQ, AW	Reject	No facilities - school - doctors - shop - roads to support this many people
AQ, AW	Reject	The village cannot sustain this amount of new houses. It is not just about people making money. I would hope anyway
AQ, AW	Reject	Scale of proposed development is too great this is not infill but almost a doubling of the existing community at Chelston Rise
AQ, AW	Reject	There are only 50 houses in Chelston Rise. This development would increase its size by 140% which totally changes the character of the area.
AQ, AW	Reject	This plan imposes too much on green space and is a large plan for a small area
AQ, AW	Reject	This will change the whole concept of a village local infrastructure not sustainable.
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a development
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a development
AQ, AW	Reject	Too large!
AQ, AW	Reject	Too many houses for the plot of land, will look cramped in.
AQ, AW	Reject	Too many houses. Would generate too much traffic which would impact upon Caldecott and Chelveston as people travel through going to/from work/shops etc.
AQ, AW	Reject	Too much growth
AQ, AW	Reject	Would have negative impact on Caldecott and Chelveston
AQ, AW	Reject	Would prefer to see the smaller development.
AR, AT	Reject	Greenfield site
AR, AT	Reject	Absolutely no requirement for these at all. It would no longer be a village and the traffic would be horrendous.
AR, AT	Reject	Again far too large a development. This kind of development would deeply sadden me.
AR, AT	Reject	Already issues with using Bidwell Lane as a rat run
AR, AT	Reject	Completely unsuitable for the site.
AR, AT	Reject	Far too many houses, would ruin the village completely.
AR, AT	Reject	Far too many houses
AR, AT	Reject	Far too many houses
AR, AT	Reject	Far too many houses proposed and density of building out of character with existing

NDP-S019b	WPG	70 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AR, AT	Reject	Its absolutely ridiculous that in the last 10 years caldecott has been the victim of many propositions, people live here for a reason and they do not need it ruined by this amount of houses. The traffic would increase. It would no longer be a pleasant and quiet place to live with pretty views, because there would be new build ugly houses everywhere and a huge amount of people. I completely oppose this proposition.
AR, AT	Reject	How could the village cope with the increase of this size? We have no shops, no PO etc Every house would need at least one car and most would need 2 or more . This is a village not a town
AR, AT	Reject	I feel this development is too big. It would spoil the close, community feel of Chelston Rise. There would be a large increase in traffic coming through the village of Caldecott.
AR, AT	Reject	Not needed
AR, AT	Reject	Outrageous size of development and additional traffic. Another great money making scheme from large developers and land owners
AR, AT	Reject	Over development
AR, AT	Reject	Money making scam that will create havoc in the form of massive traffic invasion into caldecott.
AR, AT	Reject	Too crowded not in keeping with rest of area. 1.5 times houses that are already there for half plot size
AR, AT	Reject	Too many dwellings proposed
AR, AT	Reject	Too many dwellings proposed. Existing road not suitable for such an increase in vehicles arising from so many more houses.
AR, AT	Reject	Too many houses. Would spoil the close, community feel of the development.
AR, AT	Reject	Too many proposed on site
AU	Reject	I would rather 5-10 houses
AU	Reject	70 houses would spoil a lovely place.
AU	Reject	Absolutely NOT - At present there are 50 houses in Chelston Rise, putting in 70 would increase the development by 120% - this is pure greed on the developers part and not needed.I am not a NIMBY, and putting say 9 houses, on the footprint of where the American School, would be an option I would have no problem . If this amount of houses were put in it, with an average 2 cars per household, plus visitors, delivery and service vehicles, Chelston Rise could see an extra 600 traffic movements per day. The infrastructure of the mains water and sewage system, and already poor internet service would not cope. This proposal equates to a density of approximately 14 dwellings per acre, clearly at the higher end of residential development for a rural location
AU	Reject	Too many houses - would swamp the existing residents and additional traffic with no facilities
AU	Reject	Chelston Rise & Caldecott has for a great many years been a small community & the residents pay a premium in rents/taxes to enjoy these
AU	Reject	Far to many houses in a small place
AU	Reject	Far too many

NDP-S019b	WPG	70 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AU	Reject	Far too many houses for such a small area!
AU	Reject	Far too many houses. more than doubling in area. Less that 1/2 the size. The area floods and this amount of houses would be a disaster
AU	Reject	Feel this would be too many houses for the area.
AU	Reject	BACK TO THE DRAWING BOARD FOR THIS ONE. IF THE ENTIRE SITE HAD AN ADDITIONAL 12 HOUSES ONLY. THERE'S NO NEED FOR A SHOP OR ANY ADDITIONAL ACCESS PATH.PLEASE DO NOT CONSIDER ANY PROPOSAL OF THIS SCALE AS IT WOULD GREATLY DESTROY THE CHARACTER OF THE CURRENT SITE. ANY ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE IDENTICAL TO CURRENT HOUSES. 12 MAXIMUM
AU	Reject	i moved here for the space and safeness for the children. this is completely taking away the whole feel of the estate. i would definately move if this proposal went ahead. it is totally taking away the whole reason we moved here
AU	Reject	I think 70 houses would spoil Chelston Rise
AU	Reject	I think these plans will be too crowded and not fit with the existing estate
AU	Reject	I think this site would be overcrowded with 70 more homes (more than double the existing number). I feel that the site's quiet, family oriented nature & general safety (especially for young children on roads) would be compromised.
AU	Reject	Insufficent space
AU	Reject	Loss of rural area. Excessive traffic, loss of community closeness, loss of natural wildlife, noise, pollution - already from lorries etc. Village not large enough for excessive traffic.
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	We moved to area for village location. Building on this land would ruin any views, quiteness or countryside feel it would be like living in a town. A local shop.
AU	Reject	I moved for a village & rural living Building would ruin the views & countryside. I don't want to be living in a town again. A local shop would be nice
AU	Reject	I would support a MAXIMUM of TEN houses to continue the "horseshoe" 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 - As long as they match the outsides of the current houses. They must not stick out
AU	Reject	No need for this development. People moved here to get away from estates and all this being built in Rushden, Higham. The local infrastructure would not take such an influx and is not needed. WPG just want to make as much money - and RUN
AU	Reject	The development going on in rushden negates any need to develope a greenfield site
AU	Reject	The proposal will seriously affect the unique nature of the setting. Too many cars. Too cramped.

NDP-S019b	WPG	70 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AU	Reject	There is not enough room for 70 dwellings and there would be no size garden and you would be looking over your neighbours and the modern design would not be in keeping with Chelston Rise.
AU	Reject	This even bigger proposal is totally out of the question. The natural beauty of this peaceful area will be spoilt beyond recognition, the increase in traffic will be enormous & the local infrastructure has no services to accommodate non car users.
AU	Reject	This would turn us from a rural estate to a village. Huge increase in congestion and further damage to local roads. Increase in noise pollution. Ruin the rural setting the estate has. Further demand on local utilities, would involve major disruption.
AU	Reject	To many houses and to many cars
AU	Reject	Too many houses and not in keeping with the shape of the estate
AU	Reject	Too many houses for size of land. Would increase congestion on local roads.
AU	Reject	Too many houses in too small a space. it takes away the fields and tarmac playground which the kids on the estate have got used to. we also already have drainage/sewage problems with the pipes being too small, so another 70 houses would cause even more problems
AU	Reject	Too many properties! NO
AU	Reject	Village has been small community for many years. Premium rents paid to enjoy
AU	Reject	Will definitely ruin it & be far too much traffic
AU	Reject	Would double the size of Chelston Rise and Caldecott and be completely out of keeping with the area.
AU	Reject	Would like to keep this area quiet. Would have al the cars here our children wouldn`t be safe.
AU	Reject	Would rather a smaller development
AU	No Opinion	Not allowed to object, due to covenants in my deeds that prevent me from objecting.

[NDP-S020a](#) CRE Additional Renewable Energy Facilities

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	44 (35 with no comments)
Conditional Support	22 (1 with no comments)
Reject	272 (145 with no comments)
No Opinion	12 (11 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S020a

Post Code	NDP-S020a Votes	NDP-S020a Comments
AF, AG, AP	Support	Enough damage
AF, AG, AP	Support	I think renewable energy is the way forward
AR, AT	Support	Land at moment not fit for arable farming more of a brown field site
AR, AT	Support	Re-use of Brown Field site
AU	Support	Adequate access away from the surrounding villages must be provided.
AU	Support	However concern over trucks + traffic volume.
AU	Support	I support renewable energy not houses
AU	Support	New entrance ie Kimbolton Rd
AU	Support	Provided the development does not infringe on Chelston Rise more than now
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Consideration must be given to the amount of traffic using the local roads. There has been an increase in the amount of lorries using Raunds Road recently
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	No energy production from waste materials
AD, AE	Conditional Support	I would like to see an artist's perspective in order to clearly see the impact on the landscape, and a larger view of the potential benefits for the area.
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Providing an alternative traffic route was arranged - too much traffic in a small village would cause problems
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	As long as the noise is similar to the current situation and the traffic flow down the runway isn't unbearable this would be fine. Also I don't want to see any huge warehouses or energy developments from the village, as we already have the wind turbines to fill our skyline! (Big "fan" of them by the way, pun intended.)
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Limited additional renewable energy facilities would be appropriate but the site is already at its limit traffic wise
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	The current renewable options (wind and solar) have become part of the landscape, that any additional services should be reduced to give the least amount of growth of existing renewable technologies.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Improve the surrounding road network.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	No waste facilities just solar park.

NDP-S020a	CRE	Additional Renewable Energy Facilities
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Further development did not have any visual impact from surrounding villages, cause noise, smells or traffic issues. Suggest restrictions to solar arrays only
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	PV and wind ok I reject the other parts ref waste
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	The proposals for this area are currently unclear so it is difficult to comment. Generally, the installation of renewable energy hardware is acceptable. A few more turbines are not a problem. Will there be more traffic? Are facilities adequate?
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	The proposed developments for this site are far too vague for me to feel comfortable in supporting it. In particular I would need reassurance about the nature of any proposed waste applications. However, I agree in principle that the area should be designated as a renewable energy park, provided that all planning regulations are strictly adhered to.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	There is no information on what is planned for this site so we have no idea what we would be agreeing to. As a result I cannot support this application as it stands.
AU	Conditional Support	As long as there was <u>no</u> waste processing and the road was re-surfaced and decent fencing erected
AU	Conditional Support	Entrance via Kimbolton Road
AU	Conditional Support	I would support this proposition providing it does not create an eyesore or take away the beauty of the countryside - the reason why I purchased my own property!!
AU	Conditional Support	If there were time limits on work..... i believe it would create more jobs, especially for the locals
AU	Conditional Support	If this did not mean constant traffic to & from the site once it was built.
AU	Conditional Support	if this was spread over a longer time - up to 2035
AU	Conditional Support	No changes, just need more information
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Air pollution would potentially increase for us all and I think they have been allowed to develop enough, have they thought of having a visitor centre
AB, AS, AY	Reject	BEST KEPT FOR GRASSING
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Environment and traffic issues
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Greed only!
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I am not sure about this one at all
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I cannot vote for something that does not give a proper detail of what the land owner wants to do
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I did not want the wind turbines and renewable energy plant there in the first place so I am certainly against any further developments
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No detail means that options are wide open and uncontrolled Excessive increase in traffic volumes Detrimental impact on Chelston Rise
AB, AS, AY	Reject	NO NO IT SHOULD NEVER HAVE BEEN BUILT ON IN THE FIRST PLACE.

NDP-S020a	CRE	Additional Renewable Energy Facilities
AB, AS, AY	Reject	We have enough turbines and solar panels already
AB, AS, AY	Reject	All because of windmills No thank you
AB, AS, AY	Reject	As above
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Enough already!!!!
AB, AS, AY	Reject	The area is in danger of becoming an industrial enterprise zone open to almost anything in the name of environmental considerations.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	There is enough development of this site already
AB, AS, AY	Reject	These proposals should be strongly resisted from the very start. The entire CRE site has been built'piecemeal'. Whilst that is not illegal, it is a clear and cynical attempt to abuse the planning system and avoid the need for an Environment Impact Assessment.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many dwellings will happen
AB, AS, AY	Reject	With the current renewable energy park initiatives I can't understand how this can be a desirable housing location for the majority seeking houses and can't support it
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Would not want possible smells or landscape to be spoilt or the vast increase in lorries.
AD, AE	Reject	Enough is enough
AD, AE	Reject	Enough is enough
AD, AE	Reject	No the old airfield has already been ruined, conservation would be more suitable for this already spoiled part of Chelveston-cum-Caldecott
AD, AE	Reject	The possible haulage of waste could wreck the quietness of the village & possible smell be invasive
AD, AE	Reject	The windfarm is bad enough - the CRE group are ignorant and have no concern for the village - this would increase traffic to the area
AD, AE	Reject	We have a wind farm and solar panels which have ruined our landscape, created more traffic noise and smells. We do not need anymore
AD, AE	Reject	Chelveston already supports adequate renewable energy installations. This would dominate the village.
AD, AE	Reject	There are already sufficient renewable energy installations. Would dominate village.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	It's all motherhood statements not a proposal.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	There are already enough wind turbines that have a visual impact (nuisance) on the local residents of Chelston Rise, Caldecott and Chelveston which is totally against the environmental protection act, again the 'C' class road is not suitable for the extra traffic that would be involved
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This application is not specific enough. There is no detail for consideration they will do what they want anyway.

NDP-S020a	CRE	Additional Renewable Energy Facilities
AF, AG, AP	Reject	When the turbines become redundant I would hope the site would return to its previous greenfield village amenity. This proposal is tantamount to giving CRE to do whatever they want to, which is totally unreasonable & unrealistic
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Would create another Goosey Lodge, Wymington industrial estate with smoke being emitted 24 hours a day.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Would create another Goosey Lodge, Wymington with emissions 24 hours a day
AF, AG, AP	Reject	not needed not proven to be effective
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Additional devastation to an ever changing area of the countryside
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Feel as though I would be 'signing a blank cheque' very uneasy about supporting something so vague
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I strongly object to any more development of this nature.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I would need to know the specifics
AF, AG, AP	Reject	No more renewable energy or waste!
AF, AG, AP	Reject	No plans given Could be anything Has no respect for village views
AF, AG, AP	Reject	There is poor infrastructure for the existing development. There have been no positive outcomes from the existing development with no visitor centre or anything to encourage villagers to support such a campaign
AF, AG, AP	Reject	We have enough renewable energy facilities without adding more traffic through poor infrastructure
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Worried about impact on the village and surrounding area
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	A blot on the landscape. the obnoxious ones already up should NEVER of been put up. A WASTE OF TIME
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Dangerous traffic levels would be needed to support this on tiny village roads. Couple this with an influx of people and some accidents, possibly fatal are bound to happen.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Deplore loss of green space to enjoy Loss of habitat for nature birds and animals Owners have already shown complete disregard for residents views!
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Don't want to see anymore wind turbines.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I love walking on the air field- or I used to , it's covered with litter now busy with lorries thundering down the road. The turbines are okay but the solar panels are an eye-soar. , further development will change the atmosphere further.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	It's already overdeveloped, losing the desolate feel

NDP-S020a	CRE	Additional Renewable Energy Facilities
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Regret loss of habitat. Owners CRE have shown no regard for existing residents.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	There is enough there already and it will only increase traffic.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	We do not know if these applicatins are efficient
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Spoilt enough already
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too big already
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I am not convinced that residents wishes would be duly considered despite assurances
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I firmly reject this as I feel that the village hasn't been considered, they are big construction and don't believe the safety has been considered this is a big NO NO
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	this will only lead to the wedge being driven in what is already becoming a peace meal development
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many lorries and movement of traffic
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	We do not need to develop any more land for energy renewal in the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Enough traffic, enough on the site
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	He has made enough money out of destroying our village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No benefit to community
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No benefit to the community
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No justifiacion. CRE has no interest in the community only money.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Our views are completely and habitually overridden by vested interests in government so it would be foolish to signal even the slightest acceptance of this venture.
AQ, AW	Reject	Eye sore.

NDP-S020a	CRE	Additional Renewable Energy Facilities
AQ, AW	Reject	I think this group has done enough damage to the village already
AQ, AW	Reject	Too many houses
AQ, AW	Reject	Already enough disruption of the countryside and effect on the wildlife and environment
AQ, AW	Reject	Bad
AQ, AW	Reject	Do not want any further development on former airfield site
AQ, AW	Reject	Don't want any further development on airfield site
AQ, AW	Reject	Further waste processing is not acceptable. Less intrusive renewable energy, such as solar panels may be a consideration I would be willing to entertain further.
AQ, AW	Reject	Haven't the proprietors already done enough damage to the neighbouring villages and countryside.
AQ, AW	Reject	I do not think this would be appropriate as we already have windmills and solar panels .
AQ, AW	Reject	Increased industrial traffic passing through the surrounding villages. Other potential disruption (eg sound and smell) from the waste operations.
AQ, AW	Reject	No are details given.
AQ, AW	Reject	Over development of the site. Wind turbines, solar panels, biofuel enough. Contrary to rural location
AQ, AW	Reject	The development at Chelveston airfield will be never ending if this is built. Too much traffic already interrupting the open countryside
AQ, AW	Reject	There is no need for this sort of expansion in a village. I don't think this village is ready for this sort of growth with extra traffic etc.. If we don't stop this how much more will be added.
AQ, AW	Reject	This is more than I would want
AQ, AW	Reject	This is not an industrial area!!
AQ, AW	Reject	This is too imposing on surrounding areas, it is intrusive and would take up green space and will deplete wildlife.
AQ, AW	Reject	This renewable energy park seems to be running away with itself. Enough is enough. This company has little regard for the surrounding villages. To them it's about profit and they view Chelveston-cum-Caldecott as easy targets. Waste processing is not wanted for the noise and smell.
AQ, AW	Reject	This will lead to further increased road traffic and would have a no long term benefit to either Caldecott or Chelveston
AQ, AW	Reject	Traffic travelling through villages unwanted and dangerous
AR, AT	Reject	Requirement and the impact to the current village from the associated traffic would be unavoidable
AR, AT	Reject	Do not want any type of waste processing plant near the village. Have had experience of living close to the bio mass site at Knotting. 24 hours of light pollution and strong unpleasant odours for most of the summer months.
AR, AT	Reject	Existing roads would not cope with more expansion
AR, AT	Reject	I do not want any further development especially a waste bio plant which causes 24 hours of light pollution and unpleasant odours throughout the year.

NDP-S020a	CRE	Additional Renewable Energy Facilities
AR, AT	Reject	I do not want any further industrial development in the village. It is too close to residential housing.
AR, AT	Reject	In my opinion CRE has ruined this village, enough is enough
AR, AT	Reject	It would ruin the landscape/natural beauty of the area.
AR, AT	Reject	Land designated as agricultural/rural land not an industrial park
AR, AT	Reject	No and absolutely no to more waste processing.
AR, AT	Reject	no more changes, there has been enough already with the turbines, solar panels, etc
AR, AT	Reject	No where enough detail. A large development (and this could be a large development) would change the dynamics of the village completely.
AR, AT	Reject	Over development
AR, AT	Reject	This area of land has already been adapted enough.
AR, AT	Reject	this is countryside not an industrial park!! it just another money making scam.
AR, AT	Reject	Already wind and solar renewable energy as well as food waster recycling centre.
AR, AT	Reject	I think we've had more than 'our share' of industrial development
AU	Reject	THE RECENT CHANGES HAVE ALREADY RUINED THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA. I WOULD NEVER HAD CONSIDERED BUYING IN THIS AREA IF I HAD KNOWN ABOUT THE PROSPECTIVE CHANGES. PLEASE DO NOT AGREE TO ANY ADDITIONAL CHANGES TO THIS SITE.
AU	Reject	A beautyfull landscape is being ruind by windfarms
AU	Reject	Already enough energy on site. Too many vehicles all day long
AU	Reject	Already large enough Would increase traffic and noise to the village
AU	Reject	As no specific plans creates an unacceptable level of uncertainty. Detrimental impact on the area.
AU	Reject	I am against this expansion of the digestate site as ths would mean there would be hundreds of lorries up and down the narrow country roads. It would be murder and the roads would not stand the heavy traffic
AU	Reject	I believe that this site has more than enough development already and would not support any further development.
AU	Reject	I do not want buildings on that field. We have wind turbines which we did not want. Any more buildings will ruin the clear views everyone here loves. No buildings at all
AU	Reject	I feel the landscape has been spoilt enough by existing windmills
AU	Reject	Increased traffic of speeding/noisy/cars/lorries. Danger to all
AU	Reject	It would be such a shame to ruin the coutryside even more than it already has been, it would no longer be a small village, surely it would be too much growth? It is also too near the turbines?
AU	Reject	Love the walks across countryside.
AU	Reject	No amenities, submission too late and will become too industrial

NDP-S020a	CRE	Additional Renewable Energy Facilities
AU	Reject	No No No No This is not a well established energy park it is in its infancy! Anaerobic an bio fuel absolutely stinks - I like to spend time in my garden, go an look at BioGen at Twinwoods, Bedfordia. I am not against country smells - these are certainly not. The land here is enjoyed by hundreds of dog walkers, cyclists and walkers, I think there is enough development already. Airfields have historically been known as nature reserves, primarily because they have always been sectioned off. How many more lorries and vans do we need going up and down this road and surrounding country lanes, in addition to the 40 tonne artics already transiting in and out of Carr Brothers
AU	Reject	no specific purpose declared on plan to leave permission open will be a mistake
AU	Reject	The claim that the former airfield site is misguided. The proposition would leave residents living next to an industrial park which is not why we bought our home.
AU	Reject	The land and surrounding area has been destroyed enough. No further development needed to site. Too much disruption.
AU	Reject	The roads could not stand all the extra traffic ie HGVs
AU	Reject	The site is big enough as it is
AU	Reject	The traffic this development has built up since opening has increased & the speeding noisy cars are a danger to both health of residents & the tranquility residents have paid to enjoy
AU	Reject	The turbines are an eyesore and you can hear them There is no need or want for further development - no need for industrial units, etc. as the entire area is rural
AU	Reject	There is far to much traffic coming in and out of this site already with disregard to the speed limits.
AU	Reject	This site is already destroyed and has ruined the open landscape. Any more development would be madness
AU	Reject	totally ruins the countryside, and will personally affect our way of life
AU	Reject	We already have the wind farm which we did not want and now solar panels any more would destroy the the reason why we moved to live here plus the impact on the wildlife
AF, AG, AP	No Opinion	I strongly oppose. Chelveston is a residential village. Not a mini industrial one.

NDP-S020b CRE Additional employment and housing opportunities

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	28 (22 with no comments)
Conditional Support	20 (0 with no comments)
Reject	290 (146 with no comments)
No Opinion	12 (10 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S020b

Post Code	NDP-S020b Votes	NDP-S020b Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	Employment opportunities without the need for transport for villagers.
AB, AS, AY	Support	I support this proposition for the sake of the younger generation in hopes that jobs & employment come from it
AD, AE	Support	With better access routes to this part of the village, this could offer all sorts of exciting opportunities for everyone
AR, AT	Support	Again land is brown field
AR, AT	Support	Re-use of brown field site
AU	Support	I think it is a good idea to have office space & restaurants/entertainment in the area.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Detailed planning is needed here. If they provide shop. Healthcare and small businesses this could be good for the village
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If more information was available and proposals were of an appropriate scale.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	More information is required
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Needs more explanation as to how this would be achieved.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Speed restrictions through Caldecott
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Would need to see detailed plans
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Although a better route to access this development would be better this plan offers more of what I feel the village would benefit from. Opportunities, amenities and not just housing!
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Providing an alternative traffic route was arranged - too much traffic in a small village would cause problems
AD, AE	Conditional Support	I would like to see a artists perspective in order to clearly see the impact on the landscape, and a larger view of the potential benefits for the area.
AD, AE	Conditional Support	If carefully monitored & landscaped
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	More info needed on nature of employment opportunities

NDP-S020b	CRE	Additional employment and housing opportunities
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Employment opportunities...yes, housing..No, I have supported a separate application for 35 more dwellings, residents from Chelston Rise would directly benefit from any employment opportunities and/or any other facilities ie doctors or shop, this would enable the residents to have their own sense of community whilst keeping the benefits of living in the countryside which they bought into when initially buying their property
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Employment opportunities...yes, housing..No, I have supported a separate application for 35 more dwellings, residents from Chelston Rise would directly benefit from any employment opportunities and/or any other facilities ie doctors or shop, this would enable the residents to have their own sense of community whilst keeping the benefits of living in the countryside which they bought into when initially buying their property
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	I would only support the healthcare centre. Endorse their road safety comment!
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Not enough detail given but small development residential and industrial could be welcomed.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Only employment small scale not residential
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	The number of units (including housing and industrial) were kept to reasonable number (eg 30) The surrounding roads were improved. Additional traffic through surrounding villages was managed to ensure the safety of residents in those surrounding villages.
AU	Conditional Support	I would support a smaller project ie the same as Chelston Rise
AU	Conditional Support	I would support this if there was not so many houses. Maybe 50 houses like Chelston Rise
AU	Conditional Support	No changes, just need more information
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Hideous proposal !!
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Environment and traffic issues
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I did not want the wind turbines and renewable energy plant there in the first place so I am certainly against any further developments
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I don't consider this is a good place to build more homes which will ultimately suffer from the effects of the biomass plant & HGV traffic etc
AB, AS, AY	Reject	With the current renewable energy park initiatives I can't understand how this can be a desirable housing location for the majority seeking houses and can't support it
AB, AS, AY	Reject	As there is no detail of the development I cannot vote for this
AB, AS, AY	Reject	NO NO IT SHOULD NEVER HAVE BEEN BUILT ON IN THE FIRST PLACE.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	GRASSING ONLY
AB, AS, AY	Reject	How can this be classed as a brownfield site. Using the area during the war during surely cannot constitute a valid reason for development now!

NDP-S020b	CRE	Additional employment and housing opportunities
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I find it quite ridiculous that consideration is being given to building residential dwellings on the same site as a Waste Treatment Plant, Wind Turbines and many hectares of Solar Panels. I would be very surprised to see such an application get any support from Planning Officers
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not clear what they want - they have already done they like
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not fair on Chelston Rise residents
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not possible to determine decision as no details given too vague
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not required with the expansion plan for this 20 year period.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Once again, sheer greed! where will it end with these people?
AB, AS, AY	Reject	All because of windmills No thank you
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No detail means that options are wide open and uncontrolled Excessive increase in traffic volumes Detrimental impact on Chelston Rise Impact of traffic on Caldecott This amount of development is not required here Their approach was underhand and not in the spirit of the NDP process CRE cannot be trusted
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too generic in order to make an informed decision
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too large a development and feel there is a semblance of "bribery" when quoting local infrastructure to be provided e.g shop + healthcare surgery
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many dwellings will happen
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too much development this will become a small town, the roads are not suitable for more traffic
AD, AE	Reject	We have a wind farm and solar panels which have ruined our landscape, created more traffic noise and smells. We do not need anymore, too much traffic and noise. We live in a village, not an industrial estate.
AD, AE	Reject	The windfarm is bad enough - the CRE group are ignorant and have no concern for the village - this would increase traffic to the area - totally unacceptable and where would it stop
AD, AE	Reject	No the old airfield has already been ruined, conservation would be more suitable for this already spoiled part of Chelveston-cum-Caldecott
AD, AE	Reject	Not clear as to what the development would provide. Also in same category as NDP-S020a it would dominate the village and set up a separate community in its own right.
AD, AE	Reject	Not enough information

NDP-S020b	CRE	Additional employment and housing opportunities
AD, AE	Reject	There are already sufficient renewable energy installations. Would dominate village. Would create a separate community. Not clear as to what development would provide.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Access too big
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Additional devastation to an ever changing area of the countryside
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Again - what are the specifics
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Again strongly object. Chelveston is a small hamlet / village and this would dramatically change views.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Again, no detail. This development is not connected in any way to our village. Someone has just thrown this in, talk of shop/surgery is nonsense.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Building here would spread the village too thinly and would encourage expansion inwards towards the main village, so eventually it would become a town. Also I feel Chelveston should be strictly residential (with exception to the current energy project). Chelveston is a tight community (even with Chelston Rise) and building out this far would reduce this.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I just don't think it's time yet.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Inappropriate for area
AF, AG, AP	Reject	It`s not a proposal. I would support some development, but need details. Anyway it`s not a brown field site.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	No plans given. They could not care what they do
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Not required
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Not specific enough
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Nowhere near enough detail! CRE have consistently failed to provide information to time, as well as springing ideas onto the committee and the Village without notice. They have not responded when asked questions and still haven't given anywhere near enough detail about their proposal.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Previous development supported for Chelston Rise within this document increase this part o the village to double it's existing size. Further increase would destroy the character and feel. Further, unsure what is meant by'small businesses'.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	The introduction of homes and businesses in the vicinity of existing and permitted renewable services would be unacceptable as it mixes too many potentially conflicting/impacting developments.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	The road network wouldn't support this "new town"
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This is not needed, the best masterplan is to forget it altogether
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This is totally inappropriate for an undeveloped green field site & this proposal is tantamount to giving CRE to do whatever they want to, which is totally unreasonable & unrealistic.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This would totally change Chelveston. Strongly opposed to any further developments.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too big for this community - where would the children go to school? Would increase through traffic considerably.

NDP-S020b	CRE	Additional employment and housing opportunities
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too large, and in a rural area and would increase traffic considerably.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Way to big
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Would swamp the existing Chelston Rise
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I am not convinced that residents wishes will be duly considered
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Airfield to busy
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Airfield too busy
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Any employment can be from existing villages No confidence in existing owners - would ignore local concerns as shown by installation of the wind turbines
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Enough traffic, enough on the site
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Forget renewable
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Has never been discussed prior to village developmnt plan. Owners cannot be trusted.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Infringing on to the airfield
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Irrelevant war time detail and unreasonable proposal.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	It does not look like a brownfield site when I walk there. Selected sympathetic development is reasonable but this is too much from a company that has only profit in mind and no consideration for the local community.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No benefit to residents
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No benefit to residents
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No more houses in this area are desired. As for employment this will only be for a few and they will be from outside the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Over development. Worried about road structure - extra traffic on narrow country roads
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Roads through the village are reaching saturation point already at various times of t housing with roads as they are now would just be absolute chaos.he day. Mass

NDP-S020b	CRE	Additional employment and housing opportunities
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many lorries and movement of traffic
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	The shop and the Doctors will be promised as a sweetener to get support. But as usual they will never be built.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too big already
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many houses at this rate Chelveston will become a town
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too much development along this strip, again don't want village becoming a town, don't agree with this and don't agree with who wants to build
AQ, AW	Reject	What does this mean?
AQ, AW	Reject	Again - need school, doctors improved road
AQ, AW	Reject	Haven't the proprietors already done enough damage to the neighbouring villages and countryside.
AQ, AW	Reject	This is more than I would want
AQ, AW	Reject	Bad
AQ, AW	Reject	Do not want any further development on airfield site
AQ, AW	Reject	Don't want any further development on airfield site
AQ, AW	Reject	Insufficient information
AQ, AW	Reject	Insufficient information- if they cannot be bothered to put a plan together why should we be bothered to give them permission
AQ, AW	Reject	Negative impact on surrounding villages due to traffic and extra people
AQ, AW	Reject	Ruining the village aspect. Overall development dramatically altering the feel of the village
AQ, AW	Reject	I think this group has done enough damage to the village already
AQ, AW	Reject	There is no need for this sort of expansion in a village. I don't think this village is ready for this sort of growth with extra traffic etc.. If we don't stop this how much more will be added.
AQ, AW	Reject	The development at Chelveston airfield will be never ending if this is built. Too much traffic already interrupting the open countryside. Too big
AQ, AW	Reject	Site is not brownfield. Proposal is too great a scale in context of existing developments. Local roads are not suited to such large scale developments. Proximity of turbines and biomass should also be considered
AQ, AW	Reject	The expansion of Caldecott is sufficient to date and for the next 20 years. To include this would have an affect on the road traffic that would mean country lanes to be widened to take excess traffic including that from NDP-S019A. Possibly to be reconciled in 20 years for next neighbourhood plan

NDP-S020b	CRE	Additional employment and housing opportunities
AQ, AW	Reject	The plan does not state the number of dwellings. I treat the company with suspicion and wonder how many people do or will employ locally,
AQ, AW	Reject	This application is too large for the area. Instead of increasing the sense of community it would alter the village and make it into a town with no facilities.
AQ, AW	Reject	This development on top of other plans would totally change the character of the village
AQ, AW	Reject	This is too imposing on surrounding areas, it is intrusive and would take up green space and will deplete wildlife.
AQ, AW	Reject	To big of an area will change the countryside for the worse.
AQ, AW	Reject	To large a development for the area.
AQ, AW	Reject	Unknown quantity
AR, AT	Reject	A huge development which would increase traffic and spoil the whole feel of the community.
AR, AT	Reject	Another money making scheme out of cheap agricultural land. This is a rural area not a housing estate
AR, AT	Reject	In my opinion CRE has ruined this village, enough is enough
AR, AT	Reject	Existing roads would not cope with more expansion
AR, AT	Reject	Can not support an area for development without details of what and density
AR, AT	Reject	Don't want to live in large residential area. Have chosen to live here because I want to live in a quiet village and happy to travel to shops/surgery etc. If I had wanted such local services/infrastructure I would have chosen to live in a more built up area. The increase in dwellings would totally change the character of the area and create a small town. Traffic would considerably increase on roads not built for large volumes of traffic and make the roads more dangerous.
AR, AT	Reject	I don't want a shop near. I am happy to live without any local services
AR, AT	Reject	Insufficient detail
AR, AT	Reject	No detail. This is a very large area and I would like to know more detailed proposal before even considering this potentially very large development
AR, AT	Reject	Not enough information given by the developer. CRE has been vague about detail in the past and I feel the same about this proposition. This is a big area and could accommodate many dwellings so I fear 'the worst' from CRE.
AR, AT	Reject	Not required . would spoil the villages especially so to increased traffic.
AR, AT	Reject	Over development
AR, AT	Reject	No more changes, there has been enough already with the turbines, solar panels, etc
AR, AT	Reject	There is no need for this, there is raunds, rushden and higham close by for employment.
AR, AT	Reject	This huge development would have an adverse effect on both Chelston Rise and Caldecott. Traffic levels would be hugely increased.

NDP-S020b	CRE	Additional employment and housing opportunities
AR, AT	Reject	This will be massively intrusive for caldicott & will not provide positive benefits. traffic will be horrendous in caldicott.
AR, AT	Reject	Totally unsuitable. No consultation, very vague.
AU	Reject	Again I feel this would spoil the landscape and the friendly community atmosphere which already exists.
AU	Reject	Again please reject. Residents do not wish to live next to an industrial park.
AU	Reject	I do not want buildings on that field. We have wind turbines which we did not want. Any more buildings will ruin the clear views everyone here loves. No buildings at all. Do not ruin our views - that's why we love this place - my animals are consistently near that field & I don't want to have to fear for their safety
AU	Reject	Former farm land then temporarily used as airfield in times of emergency, to give open planning permission for this parcel of land without knowing exactly what is planned can lead to a small town built.
AU	Reject	Further housing is not needed. If all proposals were to be improved the area would be turning into a small town. People live here because it is quiet. Development not needed. Huge impact on local environment, increased congestion, major disruption to area.
AU	Reject	I can't see why we need such a big development in a rural location. The wind turbines and bio mass surely would be far too close to any housing built in this area.
AU	Reject	I have only been here a year and feel we have a strengthened sense of community. Where is the evidence to their proposal, this is a village, we don't want a town!!! Again boils down to greed.
AU	Reject	I live in a village not a town It would be unsightly & not needed
AU	Reject	I moved to the country to get away from houses filled with unsightly people. No need for that much development
AU	Reject	It was never for residential it was always for industry
AU	Reject	It was never meant to be for housing, it was always meant to be industrial. what has housing got to do with renewable energy?
AU	Reject	It would destroy the view of the land
AU	Reject	It would totally spoil the quiet and peaceful area around Chelston Rise and the village of Yelden. No way!!
AU	Reject	Loss of countryside, excess traffic.
AU	Reject	Love the countryside as it is, too much going to building sites.
AU	Reject	Moved for village feel from living in a town, we don't want the countryside ruining.
AU	Reject	No amenities and too close to windfarm and waste site
AU	Reject	No more houses especially next to windfarm & waste plant
AU	Reject	Not discussed at residents meeting. Further housing is not wanted.
AU	Reject	On edge of village boundary so not in keeping with any planned development. Would turn a rural area into an Industrial Estate

NDP-S020b	CRE	Additional employment and housing opportunities
AU	Reject	Plenty of opportunities within local towns without spoiling landscape. Military base closed for many years which is why we chose to live here
AU	Reject	Plenty of opportunities within local towns without spoiling landscape. Military base closed for many years which is why we chose to live here - away from rat race
AU	Reject	There is too much traffic already & the lorries do not stick to a speed limit. More lorries would only make things worse.
AU	Reject	This area was used in a world war and a cold war. Why try and use a rural area with B roads and more people and try to create a 'new town'
AU	Reject	This is not renewable energy and would also increase traffic.
AU	Reject	This proposition would ruin the whole parish and that of yelden as the area would feel like a small town. How can this be even considered so close to the wind turbines?
AU	Reject	This should be classified as a green field site since it has been used as farm land, historically. Accomodation in the past fulfilled a national need in the time of war and could not have been intended to create an area for overdevelopment. A small town could be built without allowing for objections.
AU	Reject	This site is already developed enough!
AU	Reject	To close to wind mills
AU	Reject	Too many
AU	Reject	Totally unacceptable, far too big, it will ruin everyones way of life,
AU	Reject	We do not need a housing estate
AU	Reject	We do not need this size of development. We are close enough to the other towns so we do not need a surgery etc
AU	Reject	We moved away to here to escape industrial parks these should be built on brown field sites. there is not the roads to support an industrial site
AQ, AW	No Opinion	How can I comment on this "proposal"? It is a good idea to have a designated area for renewable energy equipment. But much more information is needed before any real assessment can be made
AQ, AW	No Opinion	More information needed before I can make an informed decision.

NDP-S021 **Stuart Carr** **50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space**

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	41 (31 with no comments)
Conditional Support	46 (1 with no comments)
Reject	251 (121 with no comments)
No Opinion	12 (10 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S021

Post Code	NDP-S021V	NDP-S021C
AB, AS, AY	Support	I can see no other use for this land.
AB, AS, AY	Support	I think stone cottage would look ok
AB, AS, AY	Support	We do not need a new village hall, grants in place for refurbishment of existing Hall. Heritage!!
AD, AE	Support	This offers everything new housing, facilities. This could bring the village alive and a better community feel
AD, AE	Support	This proposed development offers the extra facilities as well as housing I feel myself an family could benefit from.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	More houses in the centre of the village would be good as would the extra facilities
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	no problem except for access-will this be via water lane?
AR, AT	Support	A well thought out building scheme which would offer extra amenities to the village.
AR, AT	Support	natural development from centre of village. No need for further village hall and not ribbon development development
AR, AT	Support	This site sits well next to the existing village of Chelveston. The village hall and play areas would be a valuable facility for the village.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Fewer houses
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	I FEEL IT IS TO BIG TO EARLY
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If there were less houses & I don't see that we need a new village hall when the existing one has grants to do it up & what would happen to it.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	No need for village hall, unsure why the proposal was just re-submitted as is from previous refusal
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Number of houses reduced by at least half
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Provision of playground
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Provision of playground/recreational area
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	There is no need for a new village hall

NDP-S021	Stuart Carr	50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space
AD, AE	Conditional Support	50 houses is too much - 25/30 more acceptable. I like the idea of a village green and play area to improve community relations. The house need to look attractive on approach from Higham.
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Fewer properties
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Only if the no of dwellings is reduced to 25
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Remove through road to Duchy Close Reduce/cap houses at 25 Remove 2 bed cheap housing Keep village green & hall
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	1. A large Village Green was gifted to the Village and put hard up against the houses in Duchy Close to protect their outlook. 2. The New Village Hall idea was ditched. 3. No access off the Higham Road - access should be School House Corner 4. The total number of houses was 25 now and 25 after 2035
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Fewer houses, and provided recreation land was provided. Do we need a new village hall?
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	No need for the village hall, get rid of it
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	No Village Hall - recreation land yes, hopefully more families to buy
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Numbers reduced
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Reduced numbers
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	The number of dwellings was reduced by 20%. The access to the development is considerate to walkers who use the footpaths on B645. There is an installation of road safety speed limits and pedestrian crossings
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	This is the big one, if this is done well this could be the only development the village needs, if the streets weren't narrow and the houses of similar build to duchy this would be great. Like I said any more than this and the village would be expanding far too rapidly. But this development would breathe a whole new life into the village. I would say 20-30 dwellings of similar type to duchy close or mallows grange in stanwick would be the perfect number. Again, new pub:no , BIGGER pub: YES. This larger pub (in accompanment to this dwelling development) would be a huge attraction for the village and the new village hall would have to be modern and large so village events, fetes can occur. A new Chelveston...but not too big. As long as everyone knows everyone.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	50 houses too many
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	I think that 25 houses would be nearer the mark.

NDP-S021	Stuart Carr	50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	I would support this proposal if the whole package is tied into one contract to ensure that we do not get the houses without the additional facilities. I would also prefer fewer, larger houses.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	if cut down to 20 & affordable
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	If the large Chelston Rise development did not go ahead I would support this, I think on the whole the plan is good but combine this and another 35 or 70 house development and it would overwhelm the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Looks overcrowded. Would rather see fewer better/larger houses.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	50 houses in this area represents a 33% increase in the village housing. The idea of using this area for housing and the proposed facilities is good. The number of houses proposed should be reduced. There should be no access via Duchy Close to avoid the establishment of a rat run.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	I feel that the proposed development is far too big and would impact hugely on the village. I welcome the proposal for a recreational facility, something sadly missing from the village at present. I also feel that a new village hall would be a welcome asset. The existing facility is rather small and in need of updating. However, my main concern is the proposed access which I understand to be via Duchy Close which already struggles to cope with the traffic for existing residents. Most of the houses on Duchy Close have insufficient parking space and consequently residents are forced to park second and even third cars on the road. This renders the road to a virtual single carriageway and makes life very difficult for guests visiting residents, delivery trucks, refuse collection etc. Increasing traffic using the close would make life intolerable. Unless more sensible access can be found this proposal must be rejected.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	If facilities - doctors school, shop in place before development.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Less houses - village cannot support the increase in population without - doctors - school shop etc
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	No through rd from duchy close. average speed camera on main rd & two pelican crossings
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Smaller development.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Smaller no. of houses
AR, AT	Conditional Support	But need to see detailed plans before i decide.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Provided strict controls were in place for extra facilities for village
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Reduce number of houses to 30 Relocate 'green' community facilities closer to Duchy Close No requirement for 'village hall'
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Reduce the number of houses. Do we need another village hall. Does the village need recreation land

NDP-S021	Stuart Carr	50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Reduction of houses to 20 Move green play area closer to Duchy Close No requirement for village hall/community centre
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Up to 20 dwellings
AU	Conditional Support	25 HOUSES (OPEN MARKET AND RETIREMENT BUNGALOWS)
AU	Conditional Support	25 HOUSES (OPEN MARKET AND RETIREMENT BUNGALOWS)
AU	Conditional Support	If less houses were built as not to spoil views for residents & a village hall would be great for the community
AU	Conditional Support	If the number were reduced
AU	Conditional Support	It is a lovely idea but wouldn't want that many houses. Village hall would be acceptable for the community.
AU	Conditional Support	Too many dwellings but village hall would be good for community
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	An ill conceived proposal which is out of keeping with the village.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Far too many dwellings + access could be dangerous on the hill
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Increases the size of the village by too much
AB, AS, AY	Reject	It is again too many houses - Chelveston is meant to be a VILLAGE after all. Also why do we need a village hall.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not on green field. Totally change the layout of the village
AB, AS, AY	Reject	NOT TILL 2020
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development of village
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This is a quite unrealistic proposition. We will not need this number of dwellings, all in one place, for decades.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This will be the beginning of the end of our village, as this will be turning the village into a small town. Also I like the old village hall
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too big a development for Chelveston Removes green space and spoils the character of the village We don't need all these houses or another village hall Access issues and too high an impact on Duchy Close This is just money grabbing
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too big for the village
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too big outside my overall max number. Would take up to 5 yrs to complete, result in even more traffic problems & H&S issues for road access (in/out). Shop not sustainable, already have village hall

NDP-S021	Stuart Carr	50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many houses for the village. We do not need a second village hall. Having a large housing estate will totally change the feel and look of the village. This would give us at least 100 more residents cars.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Traffic implications, too large, visual approach to village impaired.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Way too many
AB, AS, AY	Reject	We have a village hall which serves the purpose well. This development would be large for the road network.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	With no requirement for such a big increase in the village it is rejected outright
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Would entirely ruin the look of the village, such a large development is too big for the size of the village
AD, AE	Reject	Relative to the size of the village this development is too big and changes the character of the village - increases village by 30%. There are also access and traffic flow issues arising from this plan. Not sure there is currently a need for a new village hall.
AD, AE	Reject	Site too large for the village.
AD, AE	Reject	Too large development for the village
AD, AE	Reject	Too large for this village and a new village hall should not be used to sway decision.
AD, AE	Reject	Too many dwellings relative to the current size of the village. Negative impact on character of village. Road not suitable for the volume of traffic generated. Not convinced of the need for a new village hall.
AD, AE	Reject	Too many houses. Keep Chelveston a small village
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Extends the village and is not to my mind classified as infill. Potential black spot for cars entering and leaving the new site
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Far to big for Chelveston at this stage.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I strongly oppose the building of a village hall on this site. If it were to be hired for parties, weddings etc due the noise would be heard all around the village and parties could be a nightmare . We have a very good village hall. Also who would pay for it`s upkeep.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I understood the house attached to the present village hall provided funds from rent for the upkeep of the hall. How would a new one be funded? Totally unsuitable place when there is an adequate building now.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	In a village the size of Chelveston a build of this size is totally unacceptable
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Insufficient access, too many houses.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	It would change the whole nature of the village, both actually & visually. It is on a greenfield site, which once developed could easily lead to even more development on the adjacent site. It is in effect a housing estate.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	It's too big and will obviously be phase 1 of a bigger plan. Would prefer the village hall to stay where it is as it links Chelveston to Caldecott
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This is far too much.

NDP-S021	Stuart Carr	50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This is overdevelopment with inadequate access to the B645. The provision of a village hall and other financial contribution is nothing short of bribery in order to secure support for this proposal.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This will have enormous impact on the village, including increased traffic through residential areas. I would consider leaving the village is this was allowed.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This would change the character of the village. If our existing village hall is having an upgrade we do not need the sweetener offered.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This would severely impact current residents on Duchy Close with no room to improve roads, the increase in traffic would endanger villagers and reduce house prices
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too big.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too big. Not wanted. Want a village not a town!
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too large, no need for village hall, we already have one currently being improved. Could later lead to further back development. Would detract from he'feel' of the village.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too large, would alter the village completely.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too much impact on Duchy Close
AF, AG, AP	Reject	We really dont need this amount of houses. chelveston wont look like large areas are built on .
AF, AG, AP	Reject	We already have a village hall! No one wants a housing estate on the field - far too many houses for a small village without facilities. Problems with flooding in Water Lane
AF, AG, AP	Reject	We do not need mass housing in the village. In previous discussions people of this village have said no to this sort of development.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Would change the village completely
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Would change village and not in a good way
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	1. Too big (80% increase) a development on the edge of the village with lose of rural aspect 2. Four new exits onto B645 already designated a Red Route - potential safety issue 3. No need for another village hall
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Do not need this amount, would spoil the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Far too big a development
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I see this development further into the future and not needed yet with all the other sites I have endorsed.

NDP-S021	Stuart Carr	50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No need for extra village hall. 50 houses would spoil rural aspects of Chelveston Safety issues from B645 ad entrances/exits to this development/
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	The village needs some housing not an entire town
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	this would not be good for the village (shades of Duchy Close). as it would greatly increase the size of a small village. Could also lead to further planning requests for the remaining part of the field at a later date.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	This would represent far too much change to a village where the landscape has already undergone so much change due to the wind turbines
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	To many houses in this area. What is proposal for exisiting village hall.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	To many houses, dangerous access point halfway up a hill that is very busy and fast despite speed notification light.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too big a development
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too big for the village. Nice to see green fields as one approaches Chelveston.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	too big, too many houses.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too big. Too many houses. No need for a 2nd village hall.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many do not need this amount
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many houses
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many houses

NDP-S021	Stuart Carr	50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many houses being built in such a short time frame. The promise of a new village hall is a very clever ploy to obtain approval for this application, so the parish should not be swayed into approving the application because of this. Chelveston already has a village hall in beautiful surroundings and should be preserved at all costs. Chelveston does not have the facilities to support the needs of this quantity of houses and would realistically be unable to provide them by 2018. Approving this development is the first step in chelveston becoming a town, which I strongly oppose as I chose to live in a small village.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many houses being built in such a short time frame. The promise of a new village hall is a very clever ploy to obtain approval for this application, so the parish should not be swayed into approving the application because of this. Chelveston already has a village hall in beautiful surroundings and should be preserved at all costs. Chelveston does not have the facilities to support the needs of this quantity of houses and would realistically be unable to provide them by 2018. Approving this development is the first step in chelveston becoming a town, which I strongly oppose as I chose to live in a small village.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	too many! and don't need another hall, recreation land or market. Access will be a problem
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too much development will make the village sprawl
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	We do not need a new village hall. Too many houses.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	wrong place. Traffic problems. Too many houses and we do not need another village hall
AQ, AW	Reject	As I live at the top of Duchy Close, this development would spoil my views, peace and quiet and also devalue my home. The development will expand the village far too much and create a big housing development of which we do not want to live in. The facilities proposed are not required. We have a beautiful village hall. No need for a park!
AQ, AW	Reject	Bad
AQ, AW	Reject	Chelveston does not need a large housing estate. It does not need a new village hall; and with less children than in the 1980's a recreation field is debateable. Access will be dangerous. It will detract from the appearance of the whole village.

NDP-S021	Stuart Carr	50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space
AQ, AW	Reject	Completely not in keeping with the existing village we don't need the sweeteners, we have a village hall. No access should be through the existing Duchy Close. It would join Chelveston to Caldecott making a single string village rather than the character of village we currently have. It is abundantly clear that further development is anticipated by the access road to nowhere adjacent to the paddock in NDP-S015. Too large a development almost increasing village by a third.
AQ, AW	Reject	Don't need new village hall. Access is dangerous into B645 and Duchy Close already car clogged. Ruin rural village atmosphere - develop village by 30%. Water services are already poor. This is effectively another village. Could lead to rest of field being developed. Do not need a shop or village green or play area. Local schools could not cope with this number of new homes.
AQ, AW	Reject	Duchy Close has a problem with parking already, to extend it would only add to the problem. We do not need a village hall, the one we have is OK. a development of this size would change the village for the worse.
AQ, AW	Reject	For this plan to work the route via Duchy Close would need to be widened. Also it would set a precedence for the field to be filled in a future neighbourhood plan. Neither of these are acceptable
AQ, AW	Reject	I do not wish to see the village increase in size with a large development. This would increase the village by a third without all the other proposals as well. Also why do we need another Village Hall when we have one just across the road which currently has funding for renovation.
AQ, AW	Reject	I feel this would be too many houses. If access was through Duchy Close this would significantly increase the through put of traffic. If access was on the main road this could be dangerous
AQ, AW	Reject	I moved here for the lovely views, and the quiet village feel. Having this development will and traffic, spoil the village views, and most importantly ruin a village feel, because it will be too big.
AQ, AW	Reject	Increase of traffic through Duchy Close.
AQ, AW	Reject	Much too big. We already have a village hall which is being up-dated, and the traffic flow would be excessive.
AQ, AW	Reject	Not suitable for lots of reasons, access - scale - water drainage if built on and would change village dramatically Has never been suitable, is not suitable now and will never be.
AQ, AW	Reject	Ridiculous. Access is dangerous. Will seem like a separate village 'stuck' on the outside. Opening Duchy Close would be better. We do not need another village hall
AQ, AW	Reject	The size of this development would completely change the character of the village. Electricity, water and other services would not be able to cope. Additional development in the location would increase the risk of flooding for downstream residences.
AQ, AW	Reject	the village cannot sustain this amount of new houses

NDP-S021	Stuart Carr	50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space
AQ, AW	Reject	This development is extending the existing perimeter of the village and enclosing existing housing. The village hall is not required as we already have one. Some people live in housing on the edge for that reason alone, and do not want to be boxed in!
AQ, AW	Reject	This many houses in one location is excessive and not supported by my family. Additional housing on Duchy Close would increase traffic on and already busy street. The land owner didn't satisfy residents' concerns over parking. The additional access from the B645 is also a concern.
AQ, AW	Reject	This would be too imposing on Duchy Close, it would be a danger to the estate/main road with movement going into and out of the new buildings. It would take up too much of the green space
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a change - would drastically alter village Extra traffic on Duchy Close
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a change - would drastically alter village Extra traffic on Duchy Close
AQ, AW	Reject	Too large scale, new village hall not required. Extends development boundary of village. This is not infill.
AQ, AW	Reject	Too large!!
AQ, AW	Reject	Too many houses. No plans for the adjacent road which is already dangerous. Increased number of vehicles passing through Duchy Close would provide a danger to the children living in Duchy Close. Views out the back of Duchy Close which enhance the quality of life of residents would be lost.
AQ, AW	Reject	Unincrease pressure on local roads and services.afe onto B645 or into Duchy Close road not suitable for extention. ? not neede. Village Hall not needed. ? rural landscapes.
AQ, AW	Reject	We do not need all these houses We do not need a new village hall or recreation field
AR, AT	Reject	A housing estate would not be in keeping with the character of the village. A precedent would be set for further development - potentially 100 + houses on the remaining land.
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural land
AR, AT	Reject	Changes, size look and feel of the village. Village already has a hall for use by the community.
AR, AT	Reject	Completely away from current feel and look of the village
AR, AT	Reject	Far too many houses - this is a village. Do not turn it into a small town
AR, AT	Reject	No major developments
AR, AT	Reject	No village hall required it would change the nature of the village and block existing views unappealing.
AR, AT	Reject	Although this may not affect me it would affect others and they may not want development. Therefore it would be inappropriate for me to make a decision that would/wouldn't affect/relate to me.

NDP-S021	Stuart Carr	50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space
AR, AT	Reject	The village hall should stay the same, people know and love it the way it is, there is memories that would be lost and history within the building. and as for that amount of houses, there is no need for 50 more houses.
AR, AT	Reject	This proposition would mean I feel, that Chelveston and Caldecott would each lose their separate entities as a village.
AR, AT	Reject	Too many dwellings relative to the size of Chelveston. It would give Chelveston the look of a housing estate rather than a village. The access is also straight onto a very busy red route. Also do not need a new village hall. The current one is being upgraded.
AR, AT	Reject	Too many proposed dwellings. The access is onto a red route and is dangerous. It could also double in size in the future once dwellings have been established.
AU	Reject	Absolutely NOT - we have a lovely traditional village hall. This is a 200% increase of dwellings
AU	Reject	Already have a village hall, to many house
AU	Reject	Far to big a development for the parish that is not needed and would make an already dangerous road even worse. I cant see any way that this development should get accepted
AU	Reject	Farm land very important to us all
AU	Reject	I reject this as it would be nearly join Chelveston to Caldecott and the access is ridiculous on that blind bend on the busy b645
AU	Reject	Local infrastructure cannot take and does not need such an influx in one go - local roads cannot take all the new motor movements. This would change the village too much
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	No need for this number of dwellings, this would change the dynamics of environment.
AU	Reject	The new village hall may be a nice idea but there's too many dwelling proposed
AU	Reject	There are far too many houses wanted on this area. It isn't big enough & will cause too much traffic & noise. We like it quiet & rural
AU	Reject	This no of proposed houses is going to make Caldecott no longer a hamlet and will become a small town
AU	Reject	This in my opinion is a ridiculous proposition that would destroy the village causing numerous problems including traffic and parking especially taking into consideration the darsdale development that will be getting built in the near future.
AU	Reject	This would increase the village size and traffic on a red route. It would also spoil the landscape
AU	Reject	Too large a development
AU	Reject	Too many houses - a village!!
AU	Reject	Too many houses - this is a village not a town
AU	Reject	Too many houses and we already have a village hall
AU	Reject	Too many residences

NDP-S021 Stuart Carr 50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space

AU	Reject	Use of open field. it will completely overwhelm the village
AU	Reject	Uses field. Too many houses in a small area. No requirement for village hall.
AU	Reject	Will create too many cars and take away our countryside.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	No Opinion	We do not need a large housing estate such as this, or a new village hall
AU	No Opinion	No changes, just need more information

Version	Download	Date	Amendments
v1.0	pdf	23rd March 2014	First release
v1.1	pdf	25th March 2014	Correction to statistical analysis of post code returns for NDP-S018b
v2.0	pdf xlsx	27th March 2014	Results for Q1-Q6 and comments made with votes for each site added