

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[Extracted from NDP-RESULTS/v2.0](#)

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

NDP-S002	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,buildinghouses 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